

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Town* 28s.; *Country*, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 29, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE QUESTION IS OFTEN ASKED, How far has the Agricultural Holdings Act come into operation? It so happens that a correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and their surveyors, recently laid before the House of Commons, furnishes us with the means of giving a tolerably accurate general answer. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, we need hardly remind our readers, are among the largest landowners in England, and have estates in many different counties. The two firms of land surveyors who act for them are gentlemen of the highest eminence in their profession, and are necessarily, both when acting for the Commissioners and for other clients, in frequent communication with landowners and tenants in every part of the country. These gentlemen, writing to the commissioners on March 22, say, "We find that the Act will be rarely adopted in the case of other landowners," and, although themselves disposed to look with some favour on the measure, they advise the commissioners that "if their tenants should be under its provisions much inconvenience might arise on a change of tenancy, by reason of their tenants being under a peculiar system of tenant right." But the most remarkable fact revealed by the surveyors is that on the part of the tenants of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners there is a "general indisposition to adopt the Act, and in many cases the tenants have already given us notice" to exclude the Act. Some of the tenants, it appears, "object to a year's notice, as it might oblige executors to hold the farm for nearly two years after the death" of the tenant; "many find their present contracts of tenancy more favourable to them than the operation of sections 13, 14, and 15 [relating to restrictions on compensation for improvements of the third class]; most fear the operation of section 19 [landlord's counter-claim]; and nearly all tenants fear the right of appeal to the county court." If these disinterested and competent witnesses are to be believed, there is no class less disposed to take advantage of the Agricultural Holdings Act than that for whose benefit it was professedly passed.

THE REPORT of the select committee on the working of the existing machinery of parliamentary and municipal elections contains, at all events, one suggestion of importance. The provision relating to illiterate voters has long been admitted on all hands to be the chief blot in the Ballot Act, and it is astonishing that it should have been allowed to remain unaltered now for nearly half the period for which the Act was originally enacted. It always causes much waste of time; in some places it seems to have been used for party purposes, and considering that no penalty is attached by the Act to signing a false declaration of inability to read, the wonder is that it has not been more extensively made use of as a device for defeating the Act. Out of sixteen witnesses examined before the committee, only one could be found to say a good word for the rule relating to illiterate voters, and the committee advise that all special provision for the assistance of illiterate voters should be abolished. As

the Attorney-General last session promised that legislation should follow the inquiry of the select committee this session, we may anticipate the speedy repeal of this absurd provision.

The other points touched upon in the report are of less importance. The committee recommend immediate legislation for the purpose of rendering clear the construction to be placed on the directions in the Ballot Act to the voter for marking his paper, and declaring the law to be in accordance with the judgment in the recent case of *Woodward v. Sarsons*, where the Court of Common Pleas, in opposition to the decision of the Scottish Court of Session in *Haswell v. Stuart*, held that the addition to, or substitution for, the statutory cross on the ballot-paper of other marks will not invalidate it, unless actual proof can be given of some sinister design, or unless it is not clear for whom the voter intended to vote. This is stated to have been the intention of the framers of the Ballot Act, and we believe this view was largely acted upon before the decision of the recent case. But we cannot help doubting whether the committee can have meant to recommend that all the decisions in *Woodward v. Sarsons* should be clothed with legislative authority. The court held that writing the name of the candidate in place of the cross invalidated the paper because the handwriting of the voter might be recognized, but they held also that his writing, in addition to the cross, a capital letter (P) would not invalidate the paper. This seems a singular construction of section 2 of the Ballot Act, under which "any ballot paper . . . on which anything except the said number on the back is written or marked, by which the voter can be identified, shall be void and not counted." An initial letter written by the voter certainly affords a means of identifying him.

Among other matters discussed is the mode of counting votes, as to which the committee do not think it advisable to restrict returning officers to any one mode, but they give, in the appendix, an account of the method pursued at Liverpool, to which, as our readers will remember, attention was drawn at the time in these columns. It is singular that the committee pass over in silence the short time allowed for preparations for a contest in a large borough. There seems to be a concurrence of opinion that in parliamentary contests in these boroughs another day ought to be allowed between the nomination and the poll.

THE OFFICIAL REFEREES are among the few public officers who are serving their country without the certainty of remuneration, and they, as well as we, must be awaiting with interest the result of the discussion on the vote for their salaries. Various rumours have been afloat with respect to the course likely to be taken by legal members of Parliament, and it is understood that in some quarters appeals have been made to allow the question to rest; but we believe that, notwithstanding, Mr. Waddy intends to persevere with what he justly regards as a public duty. Nothing can be imagined more inconclusive or unworthy of public men than to stir up a question which, when it comes to be debated, they shrink from grappling with; nor can anything be more injurious in its effects. If no notice had been taken of the appointment, the public, at least, would not have been advertised of the fact that it was an improper one; if now, without further justification, it is acquiesced in by those who raised the objection, the public will be further informed that those who appealed to the Government "to prevent what would otherwise prove a grave and very important scandal" (see *ante*, p. 396) have now come to the conclusion that that "grave and very important scandal" ought not to be prevented; or, in other words, that an appointment of such a nature as to justify an opposition to the vote of salary ought to be confirmed without being vindicated. It may be that the junior official referee has been engaged in extensive legal practice of so private a nature as to be concealed from general

knowledge, or that his legal attainments are so great that only a perverse and envious fortune has hitherto prevented their display; but if no such justification is produced, and the case is allowed to remain where it at present stands, we cannot conceive what public reason can be alleged why the question which it was proposed to raise before Easter should, after Easter, be allowed to die.

THE NEW ORDERS as to fees and per-centages indicates that the Treasury authorities have discovered some special advantage in impressed stamps, but it is not very likely that, where an option is afforded, the use of the old adhesive stamps will be abandoned. There is little else to be said about the order, save that it does not except the district registries, as did the order of the 28th of October, for which it is substituted. It may, however, be observed that the effect of clause 3 of the new order, coupled with the requirement as to a deposit in the order of the 1st of February relating to fees to be taken by the official referees, will be, where a deposit on account of fees and expenses is required before proceeding with the reference, to add a considerable number of attendances to the charges incurred in connection with a reference to the official referee. There will be (1) an attendance on the official referee, or at the registrar's office, to ascertain the amount of deposit required; (2) attendance at Somerset House to obtain form of certificate of deposit; (3) attending to present the certificate, duly stamped, to the official referee or registrar for his signature; (4) attending to procure the indorsement on the certificate of the amount of fees and expenses by the official referee; (5) if the amount of the fees and expenses exceeds the deposit, attending to produce the certificate, bearing an additional stamp, to the official referee or registrar; or (6) if the amount of such fees and expenses is less than the deposit, attending at Somerset House to obtain repayment of the difference.

THE CAUSE LIST for the Easter Sittings of the Court of Appeal presents a rather startling contrast to that for Easter Term last year. There were then 9 appeals from the Court of Chancery, and 2 appeal motions; there are now no fewer than 27 appeals from the Chancery Division, and 4 appeals from orders on interlocutory motions made in that division. Add to these 55 appeals from other divisions, 15 bankruptcy appeals, 3 appeals from orders on interlocutory motions in the common law divisions, and 3 appeals from the Divisional Court of Appeal from Inferior Courts, and the appeals reach a total of 107. It is to be observed that, with only two exceptions, the appeals from the Chancery Division have been set down since March 14. In the Chancery Division cause list the principal thing to be noted is that before the Master of the Rolls there are no fewer than 46 causes with witnesses as against 42 without witnesses.

ON MONDAY LAST, in a case of *In re Kavanagh*, the Irish Court of Appeal in Chancery announced that as to future appeals they would follow the rule laid down by the English Court of Appeal, of giving the successful appellant his costs of appeal. The revolution which has taken place in the practice of the courts of intermediate appeal on this subject, following close upon the embodiment in the rules of court of the recommendation of the Judicature Commissioners, that all costs, whether in courts of first instance or of appeal, should be in the discretion of the court, is very remarkable.

On Thursday last the Master of the Rolls stated that on Monday next he should commence sitting in the Appeal Court, and that he expected to be so engaged for several weeks, but that he had arranged to sit on the Friday and Saturday in each week in his court, when he would hear motions, petitions, &c., and, if time allowed, causes without witnesses.

THE NEW PRACTICE.

WITNESS CAUSES IN THE CHANCERY DIVISION.—In the Chancery Division the judges have been accustomed to a rapid despatch of business which it is far from easy to accomplish under the new system. Hence arises a feeling of impatience at the delay caused by taking evidence orally. The Master of the Rolls has made a bold attempt to grapple with the difficulty, and has set apart three days in the week for hearing what are now technically called "witness causes," but this course, in some instances, causes expense, especially when witnesses have to be kept in town to be ready for the "next day," which may be the following week. Vice-Chancellor Malins has declined to adopt this plan, and on Tuesday last, being the first day of the Easter Sittings, he directed that all causes, whether with witnesses or not, should be in the paper in their turn, whether they were ready to be heard or not. As a result, his paper on Thursday contained fifteen causes, ten of which were witness causes, and not one of the latter was disposed of. A considerable time was occupied in fixing days for all these witness causes, some of them so far forward as the first week in Trinity Sittings. The direction given on Tuesday was withdrawn, and it is presumed that no more witness causes will be in Vice-Chancellor's Malins's paper (except those for which days are fixed) unless they are ready for hearing. The Master of the Rolls has announced his intention of sitting in the Appeal Court for about a month, and when he returns to his own court he is likely to find an immense arrear of causes pressing for hearing. The other Vice-Chancellors have heavy cause lists before them, and there is every prospect of a block in the Chancery Division, which will become worse as time goes on, and the old chancery causes are disposed of. While we are able to say that the work of the courts has increased during the five months in which the Judicature Acts have been in operation, we are also in a position to state that the chief clerks to the judges have been far from idle. The orders made by them since the 2nd of November have exceeded by about a thousand those made during the like period in the previous year, and from the registrars and the Clerks of Records and Writs we have accounts of a great increase of business in the Chancery Division.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—ORD. 58, R. 15.—On Tuesday, April 25, in a case of *Judd v. Green*, the defendants applied to the Court of Appeal for an order that the plaintiff should give security for the costs of an appeal, of which he had given notice, from a decree dismissing his bill with costs. The suit was instituted to set aside a sale of a reversionary interest. There was a great mass of evidence, and the costs of the original hearing had been very heavy. The plaintiff had not yet paid the costs which he had been ordered to pay, and there was evidence that he had no property beyond that in question in the suit. The court (James and Mellish, L.J., and Baggey, J.A.) ordered that the appellant should deposit £150 in court as security for the costs of the appeal, and that the appeal should not come into the paper for hearing for fourteen days after the deposit had been made. The costs of the motion to be dealt with as part of the costs of the appeal. It should be added that separate motions were made by the several defendants, but only one deposit was ordered as security for the costs of all the defendants.

MOTION FOR JUDGMENT—ADMISSIONS OF FACT IN PLEADINGS—ADJOURNMENT OF FURTHER HEARING—PARTITION ACTION—ORD. 40, R. 11.—On the same day, in a case of *Gilbert v. Smith*, a question arose as to the jurisdiction of the court, under the above rule, to make an order on motion upon admissions of fact in the pleadings. The action was brought for the partition or sale of real estate. The plaintiffs claimed to be owners of one-eighth of the property, and stated that the defendants were the owners of three-sixteenths. The defendants, by their statement of

defence, admitted the facts alleged by the plaintiffs' statement of claim. The plaintiffs then, upon this admission, gave notice of motion for an order directing an inquiry who were the persons interested in the property, and in what shares, and whether such persons were all parties to the action, or had been served with notice of the order, and that the further consideration of the action might be adjourned. Before the motion came on to be heard, some other persons, who claimed to be entitled to five-eighths of the property, had obtained an order giving them liberty to attend the proceedings in the action. When the motion came on to be heard it was opposed by these persons, and Vice-Chancellor Malins was of opinion that the right course had not been taken, but that the action ought to have been set down to be heard as "short," and he refused the motion with costs. The Court of Appeal were of opinion that this was exactly the kind of case which was intended to be provided for by ord. 40, r. 11. It was intended that whenever, upon the admissions of fact in the pleadings, the plaintiff was clearly entitled to some particular order, he should be able to obtain it at once upon motion, without having to wait till the action could come on for hearing in its regular course. The object was to save expense and delay. If, however, notwithstanding the admissions in the pleadings, it was not perfectly clear that the plaintiff was entitled to any order—for instance, if there was some point of law to be argued—then the rule would not apply, and this short cut would not be open to the plaintiff. But if his title to relief was clearly admitted, then he could obtain, on motion in this summary way, any decree or order which he might have obtained on the original hearing of the action. And the court made an order directing the inquiry asked for by the motion, adding (as was done by Vice-Chancellor Hall in *Bennett v. Moore*, L. R. 1 Ch. D. 692) that, "without requiring any further prior hearing than this motion of the action, the further hearing of the action is adjourned," and giving liberty to any of the parties to apply to have the further hearing taken in chambers. The costs of all parties were to be costs in the action, and to be dealt with as the court should direct upon the further hearing.

TIME FOR APPEALING—BANKRUPTCY APPEAL—JUDICATURE ACT, 1875, s. 18; ORD. 57, r. 3; ORD. 58, RR. 9, 15. On Thursday, April 27, in a case of *Re Tellerwright, Winslow, J.C.*, applied to the Court of Appeal for a direction to the registrar in bankruptcy to enter an appeal, which he had refused to receive as being too late. The order appealed from was made on the 14th of March, but it was not signed until the 6th of April. The appeal was not tendered to the registrar until the 27th of April. *Winslow*, pointed out that by section 18 of the Act of 1875, all rules and orders of court in force at the time of the commencement of the Act in relation to appeals from the Chief Judge, except so far as they are expressly varied by the rules made under the Act, are to remain in force in the Court of Appeal until they are altered or annulled by any rules made after the commencement of the Act. But by ord. 58, r. 9, appeals from orders in bankruptcy are to be brought within the same time as is limited by r. 15 for an appeal from an interlocutory order, and by rule 15 that time is (except by special leave of the Court of Appeal) limited to twenty-one days, which period is to be calculated "from the time at which the judgment or order is signed, entered, or otherwise perfected." The twenty-one days for appealing, therefore, now began to run only from the date of the signing of the order, and not, as under r. 143 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1870, from the date of the pronouncing of the order (see *Ex parte Minton*, 23 W. R. 488, L. R. 19 Eq. 266). The court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) acceded to this view, and ordered that the appeal should be received by the registrar, subject, however (the application being *ex parte*), to any objection which might be taken by the respondents hereafter.

DEMURRER—ORD. 28, r. 6.—In a case of *Wills v. Harris*, before Malins, V.C., on Tuesday, April 25, *Sherston Baker*, for the plaintiff, applied to the court *ex parte* under the following circumstances:—The plaintiff had delivered a reply and demurrer to the defendant's pleading, and the defendant had joined issue. More than ten days had elapsed since the

demurrer had been delivered, and the defendant had neither entered the demurrer nor served notice for leave to amend his pleading. The plaintiff applied to the registrar to draw up an order under ord. 28, r. 6, that the demurrer should be allowed. This being the first application of the sort made to the registrar, he desired the direction of the court before drawing up the order. His lordship said that the demurrer should be allowed, and he directed the order to be drawn up in pursuance of ord. 28, r. 6.

REFERENCES—ORD. 36, r. 30.—On Wednesday, April 26, in a case of *Robinson v. Robinson*, before the Common Pleas Division, *Gully* moved *ex parte* to set aside an award on the ground that the arbitrator had not sat *de die in diem*, as r. 30 of ord. 36 requires. Lord Coleridge said that the interminable delays of references had long been a great scandal both inside and outside the profession. The application was made *ex parte*, and the court had not, therefore, had the opportunity of hearing what the arbitrator might say in answer to the plaintiff's case. But if the statements of the plaintiff were true, he had no hesitation in saying that disobedience to this order was such misconduct in the arbitrator as would induce a judge at chambers to remove him from the reference. But the plaintiff had made no such application; he had lain by, apparently acquiescing in the repeated adjournments of his reference, and had taken his chance of the award being ultimately in his favour. Now that the award proved to be against him, he applied to the court to set it aside. But the words of the Act were directory merely, and not imperative; hence, the alleged unnecessary delay was not in itself a sufficient ground for setting aside the award. Brett and Lindley, J.J., concurred.

DISQUALIFICATION OF JUSTICES THROUGH INTEREST OR BIAS.

NOTWITHSTANDING the attack recently made by a learned judge upon the doctrine that a judge should not hear a case in the decision of which he may be even indirectly interested, it may be confidently asserted that there are few rules which, from an early date, have been more constantly enforced, both in the way of precept and practice. Lord Raymond, it is said (2 Str. 1173), who had a house in the parish of Abbots Langley used to retire from the bench when an order affecting that parish came before the court. Lord Holt on the hearing of any question in which he was personally interested left the bench and sat by the counsel (see 21 L. J. M. C. 171). Lord Hobart in *Day v. Savage* (Hob. 87) went so far as to lay it down that "even an Act of Parliament made against natural equity, as to make a man judge in his own case, is void in itself, for *jura nature sunt immutabilia*, and they are *leges legum*." (See, however, the observation of Blackburn, J., in *Mersey Dock Trustees v. Gibbs*, L. R. 1 H. L. 110.) And Lord Holt tells of a Mayor of Hereford who was laid by the heels for sitting in judgment in a cause where he himself was lessor of the plaintiff in ejectment, though he, by the charter, was sole judge of the court (1 Salk. 395). Lord Coke furnishes, as a ground for the rule, the curious reason that men are generally more foolish in their own concerns than in those of other people (1 Inst. 377), but the real reason for its stringency is that given by Lord Campbell, in *Dimes v. Grand Junction Canal Co.* (3 H. L. at p. 793), that tribunals should "take care, not only that in their decree they are not influenced by their personal interest, but to avoid the appearance of labouring under such an influence."

The rule very early laid down with reference to justices of the peace, that any interest in the subject-matter of litigation should disqualify from hearing the case, has been confirmed in reference to particular matters by numerous statutes, declaratory of the common law, and intended to warn interested justices against exercising their jurisdiction (see *Wakefield Local Board v. West Riding, &c., Railway Company*, 14 W. R. 100, L. R. 1 Q. B. 86); while, on the other hand, it has

been modified by legislation in reference to pecuniary interests of a remote or indirect character. In the early cases the question frequently arose upon the hearing of appeals from orders of justices relating to the removal of paupers, and section 3 of 16 Geo. 2, c. 13, which enabled justices to enforce the laws concerning parochial rates, although themselves rated in the place affected by their acts, expressly continued and declared their disqualification from acting in the determination of any appeal to quarter sessions from any order relating to any parish where such justice was rated. The Legislature has relaxed this rule by providing (30 & 31 Vict. c. 115, s. 2) that a justice shall not be incapable of acting at any sessions on the trial of an offence arising under an Act to be put in execution by any local authority by reason only of his being, as one of several ratepayers, or as one of any other class of persons, liable, in common with the others, to contribute to, or to be benefited by, any fund to the account of which the penalty payable in respect of such offence is directed to be carried, or of which it will form part, or to contribute to any rate or expenses in diminution of which such penalty will go." A justice has also been enabled to act at any sessions in matters in which the board of guardians of which he is an *ex-officio* member is interested (5 & 6 Vict. c. 57, s. 15), and some other special statutory exemptions have been made. It has also been clearly established that if the objection of interest in the justice is waived by both parties he has jurisdiction, and the objection of want of jurisdiction cannot afterwards be raised (*Wakefield Local Board of Health v. West Riding, &c., Railway Company*. Subject, however, to these relaxations, the rule remains that any pecuniary interest, however small, in the subject of litigation disqualifies a justice from acting in a judicial inquiry (see *Reg. v. Rand*, L. R. 1 Q. B., at p. 232). And it is clear also that a justice who is really, though not in form, a party to the proceedings cannot sit as a judge in his own cause (see *Reg. v. Hoseasan*, 14 East, 606).

But can it be said that a man is acting as judge in his own cause when he has no beneficial pecuniary interest in the subject-matter of litigation, and is not a party to the proceedings, but circumstances exist which may tend to give him a bias in favour of one of the parties? The question seems to have been little mooted until recently, but in *Reg. v. Rand* (L. R. 1 Q. B. 230), it was considered. The facts of that case were these:—A corporation owned some waterworks, and had power under an Act of Parliament to take water from certain streams on obtaining a certificate from justices; the result of this would be to increase the value of the waterworks, and so to improve the security available to the creditors of the corporation. Two of the justices who granted the certificate were respectively trustees of a hospital and friendly society, each of which had funds invested in bonds of the corporation. Upon the objection of interest in these parties being raised, the court determined that they were not disqualified. They had no personal bias in the matter, and the only way in which their impartiality could be affected was in the direction of favouring those for whom they were trustees. But there was no "real bias," that is, we suppose, no likelihood of such affection for, or interest in, the charitable institutions as would warp the judgment of the justices.

This decision settled that mere suspicion of bias will not be sufficient to disqualify a justice from acting, but it left open the question whether, where circumstances exist affording a strong probability of bias, the justice will be disqualified. It is upon this point that the very recent case of *Reg. v. Meyer* (24 W. R. 392, L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 172) has been thought to afford some guidance. The facts were somewhat complicated; but it is sufficient for our purpose to say that proceedings were pending against Harrison, the appellant, at the suit of the Enfield Local Board, for not properly purifying sewage which he had agreed to take on his farm; also to compel him to fulfil his contract to take the sewage. Proceedings

were threatened by the Edmonton Local Board against the Enfield Local Board for a nuisance occasioned by Harrison's refusal to take the sewage. Under these circumstances, the Lee Commissioners obtained two summonses against Harrison for making openings into drains within their jurisdiction in order to turn the sewage off his farm. At a conference between the Enfield and Edmonton Boards, at which the chairman of the former board was present, it was agreed that no proceedings should be taken by the Edmonton against the Enfield Board until the result of the proceedings by the Lee Commissioners against Harrison was known. At the hearing of the summonses the chairman of the Enfield Board sat as a justice on the bench, and Harrison was convicted. The Queen's Bench Division held that the chairman of the Enfield Board was disqualified from acting, inasmuch as the case arose out of a matter in which he was a litigant party with the defendant, and as to which, therefore, he must have had a "real bias." This is the ground on which the court put the decision; but it may be suggested whether it might not have been rested on the same ground as the case of *R. v. Hoseasan*, before alluded to, in which Lord Ellenborough read a severe lesson to a justice who had heard a charge preferred by his bailiff against one of his own servants. The Enfield Board was really, though not in form, a party to the proceedings. The object of the summons was the same as that of the proceedings they had themselves taken against Harrison, and upon the result of the summons was to depend the question whether they would be involved in proceedings instituted by the Edmonton Board. The chairman in reality, therefore, sat as justice at the hearing of a case to which he was a party.

It will be seen that the case affords little help towards the solution of the question whether strong probability of bias in a justice who is in no way a party to the proceedings will disqualify him. Will such relationship to one of the parties disqualify? In *Brookes v. Earl of Rivers* (Hard. 503), it was held that the fact that the defendant had married the judge's sister could not disqualify the judge from hearing the case, "for favour shall not be presumed in a judge." The same in *Reg. v. Rand*, on the other hand, hinted that relationship to one of the parties might operate as a disqualification; but, in the face of *Brookes v. Earl of Rivers*, it can hardly be thought that this position is warranted, and it is easy to see that considerable inconvenience might arise if the rule were pushed to this length. Where are we to stop? If any and every bias is to disqualify, a very wide field would seem to be opened up.

Another point was determined in *Reg. v. Meyer*. It has long been settled that the presence on the bench of a justice disqualified by interest, who communicates with his brother justices and votes in the decision of the case, will invalidate the decision arrived at (see *Reg. v. Justice of Herts*, 6 Q. B. 753); and it is no excuse that there was a majority of justices in favour of the decision, without reckoning the vote of the interested justice (*ibid.*). In *Reg. v. Meyer*, the interested justice sat on the bench, but did not exercise any influence on the proceedings except that, after the justices had unanimously resolved to convict, he recommended a mitigation of the penalties. The Queen's Bench Division held that they could not go into the question of the part the justice took in the proceedings, and that he ought not to have sat at all. This is consistent with the decision in *Reg. v. Justices of Suffolk* (21 L. J. M. C. 169), and, we think, must be admitted to be the only satisfactory rule.

The Right Hon. Sir Montague Smith, The Right Hon. Sir John Burgess Karslake, Q.C., Mr. Justice Archibald, Mr. William Overend, Q.C., and Mr. John Lloyd Wharman, barrister (late M.P. for Durham), have been appointed commissioners to inquire into the privileges and revenues of certain municipal corporations.

Reviews.

LAW OF NATIONS.

COMMENTARIES ON THE LAW OF NATIONS. By WILLIAM OKE MANNING. A New Edition, Revised by SHELDON AMOS, M.A., &c., &c. London: Sweet; Cambridge: Macmillan.

The public are indebted to Mr. Amos for procuring the re-publication of this work, which, notwithstanding its high merits, had so far fallen out of sight that few were acquainted even with its name. That this should have been so is strange, since it occupied the position of being the best compendium in English literature of the subject to which it relates. The book is written with a familiar mastery of the subject and an amplitude of reference and illustration which at once quicken and enhance the interest of the reader, and give him confidence that the author has not learned his subject for the purpose of writing his book, but has written his book because he knew the subject; and it displays that moderation of thought, with a corresponding ease and elegance of style, which was more the gift of an earlier generation than of our own. Perhaps the neglect which has overtaken so excellent a work may be due to the fact that questions of public international law, which have of late years occupied so large a place in public attention, were, during the time which immediately followed its first publication in 1839, comparatively little heard of, and Mr. Manning's treatise had leisure to be almost forgotten before it had the opportunity of establishing its claims to regard. Now the scene has changed, and in the somewhat long interval which has elapsed, and especially in the latter portion of it, important questions of international law have been agitated, and numerous treatises have appeared both at home and abroad, some of which, with too monotonous and indiscriminate a note of approval, Mr. Manning enumerates in his preface to the present edition. The renewed attention paid to the subject renders the opportunity a favourable one for a re-issue of Mr. Manning's treatise. It is to be regretted that his health has not allowed the author to re-cast his work so as fully to accommodate it to the present time and to give us the same careful review and criticism of the diplomatic history and literature of the last thirty years which he has so admirably furnished for the previous period.

Failing this, Mr. Amos has undertaken the task of editor, and he has done this by adding some chapters on "States and their Rights" (a not very definite description of their contents, which we must allow are not themselves very definite), and by adding throughout the work notes of very unequal merit and value, and which at the best hardly do more than direct attention to the most important points in which the problems of international law have been affected by treaty, by historical events, and by the writings of jurists. It must in fairness be remembered that to edit the work of a living author is a task of great delicacy and difficulty, and we have no doubt that with a freer scope Mr. Amos' method of treatment would have been more thoroughgoing. As it is, however, we must deal with Mr. Manning's treatise pretty much as it originally stood, and look upon the present issue rather as a re-publication than as a new edition. But since the great and leading principles of international law are not changed, and the history previous to 1839 retains all its value as history, and by far the largest portion of its value as precedent, the interest of the work is little diminished by the lapse of time. Thus, notwithstanding the Declaration of Paris of 1856, and the controversies as to the rights and duties of neutrals which have occupied so much attention in recent years, the valuable and interesting book on Neutrality (book v.) will be read with undiminished interest and profit as a lively and well-digested narrative of events, a perspicuous statement of principles and rules of inter-

national law the great bulk of which stand now as they stood then, and a just and well-reasoned exhibition of the grounds and considerations on which these rules and principles rest. Still less is the able and discriminating review of the literature of the subject contained in his first book superannuated; a review which, written as it is with a liberality of feeling and elegance of style equal to its erudition, would be read with pleasure by readers who never travelled beyond the chapter which contains it, but yet would leave few content not to accompany the author through the rest of the treatise. The subject, indeed, is one which is almost equally intelligible and equally interesting to the general reader as to the lawyer. It is also one with which those engaged in public affairs ought, at least, to have so much acquaintance as they would derive from the perusal of this work; and it will be not one of the least benefits resulting from this timely re-publication if it induces public men who have been hitherto strangers to this branch of learning to acquire some familiarity with it through Mr. Manning's clear and lively pages.

OKE'S FORMULIST.

OKE'S MAGISTERIAL FORMULIST. Fifth Edition. By T. W. SAUNDERS, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Recorder of Bath. London: Butterworths.

This well-known work stands no longer in any need of introduction or recommendation; it is not so much the convenience as the necessity of every person who has to conduct or advise the conduct of a magistrate's business. It presents a detailed picture of the justice-room, and in glancing over its contents it will be found admirably to serve one purpose for which it was, probably, never intended. We will not go so far as to say that the spirit of the British Constitution may best be read out of the common forms of magistrates' business, but it would be true to say that a mere examination of the titles under which the contents of this great repertory are distributed would give to the reader a very good general idea of the police administration of the country.

To return, however, to the more proper function of the book before us, the question with any new edition of such a work as the present is, whether it has been so kept abreast with legislative changes as to preserve its character of practical utility. Although all will join with the present editor in lamenting that the public can no longer command the services of the accurate and experienced author, yet we see no reason to think that they will suffer through the duty of re-editing this valuable collection of forms having devolved upon Mr. Saunders, who seems to have performed his task with the care and accuracy which he has accustomed us to expect from him. His labour has not been a light one, for, as he points out, recent legislation has not only added to the already wide field of magisterial duties, but has also, by the process of consolidation, as well as by considerable substantive alterations, varied the necessary forms. These changes have been duly followed, and the work, which was last edited in 1868, may now be relied upon as a safe and complete guide in the matter it relates to.

The benchers of Gray's-inn have commenced legal proceedings against Dr. Kenealy to compel him to give up to them the chambers in the Inn he occupies, and which he has refused to surrender.

Lord Justice James stated, on Tuesday, that after this week the Court of Appeal will be sitting in two divisions, and that in consequence of this the day for hearing the bankruptcy appeals will be changed from Thursday to Friday. It is announced that the European Arbitration cases will be in the paper of the Appeal Court on Monday next, Queen's Bench appeals will be in the paper for hearing at Westminster on Monday next, and admiralty appeals will be in the paper for hearing at Lincoln's-inn on Wednesday next.

Notes.

ON THURSDAY, April 27, the Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.JJ., and Baggallay, J.A.) affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Thoday*, (noted *ante*, p. 336). The question was whether a third party could appeal from an adjudication of bankruptcy made against a debtor, who did not himself complain of the adjudication. The act of bankruptcy on which the adjudication was founded was the execution by the debtor of a bill of sale of the whole of his property to secure the payment of a then existing debt, and further advances. The bill of sale holder appealed. The Court of Appeal held that, though the bill of sale holder might not be conclusively bound by the finding of the court upon the making of the adjudication that the bill of sale was an act of bankruptcy (as, indeed, he hardly could be, inasmuch as it was an order made behind his back) yet the order was one which would so tend to embarrass him with regard to his security that he might fairly be considered as a person "aggrieved" by the order, and therefore entitled, under section 71 of the Act, to appeal from it. And the question of the validity of the bill of sale was one which had better be at once decided. The court then heard the case on its merits, and affirmed the order of the Chief Judge annulling the adjudication.

THE SAME DAY the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Nicholson* (noted *ante*, p. 416), to the effect that an order under section 16 of the Debtors Act, 1869, for the trustee to prosecute a bankrupt or liquidating debtor for alleged offences under that Act, ought to be made *ex parte*, and that the bankrupt or debtor is not entitled to notice of the trustee's application for the order, or to be heard in opposition to it. The court (James and Mellish, L.JJ., and Baggallay, J.A.) pointed out that the only object of having the authority of the Court of Bankruptcy for the prosecution is, as appears from section 17 of the Debtors Act, to obtain the payment of the costs of the prosecution in the same way as the costs of prosecutions for felony are ordinarily paid. The trustee, with the sanction of the creditors, could, without any order of the court, prosecute the bankrupt at the expense of the estate. The making of the order *ex parte* could in no way prejudice the bankrupt, as before he could be committed for trial the trustee would have to satisfy a magistrate, in the ordinary way, that there was a *prima facie* case against the bankrupt. The magistrate would be in no way bound by the opinion of the Court of Bankruptcy, expressed in an *ex parte* order, that there was a reasonable probability of a conviction being obtained. The language of section 18, indeed, made that plain, as it expressly provided that, when any person is charged with any offence under the Act before any justice, the justice "shall take into consideration any evidence adduced before him tending to show that the act charged before him was not committed with a guilty intent." In truth, it would be very much to the injury of the bankrupt that the order should be made by the Court of Bankruptcy upon a full investigation of the case, and after hearing him in his defence. An order thus made would amount to a preliminary conviction, and could not fail to tell against him in the subsequent proceedings. It seems also worthy of observation that, if notice of the application must be given to the bankrupt, he would have ample opportunity of absconding, of which, if guilty, he would probably avail himself, and thus the ends of justice would be defeated. This is the first occasion on which the construction of these provisions of the Debtors Act has been determined by the Court of Appeal, and the decision is important as settling the practice for the future.

THE SAME DAY, in a case of *Re Partridge*, the question arose whether an appeal had been brought in time. The order appealed from had been pronounced on the 29th of February; the appeal had not been entered till the 24th of March. The Court of Appeal held that, by virtue of the order of the 26th of May, 1873 (*vide* 17 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 715), Sundays are not to be reckoned in the twenty-one days allowed by r. 143 for entering an appeal, and consequently that the appeal was in time. In thus deciding the Court of Appeal adopted the construction put upon the order of May, 1873, by the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Hicks* (23 W. R. 862,

L. R. 20 Eq. 143). But, as will be seen by the decision of the court in a case of *Re Tellwright* (heard at a later period of the same day, and noted in another page), r. 143 and the order of May, 1873, do not now regulate the time for appealing from orders in bankruptcy to the Court of Appeal; that time is now fixed by ord. 58, rr. 9, 15, under the Judicature Acts. In *Re Partridge*, the attention of the court was not directed to these rules. But, inasmuch as r. 143 and the order of May, 1873, continue to regulate the time for appealing to the Chief Judge from orders in bankruptcy made by county courts, the expression of the opinion of the Court of Appeal is important as affirming the view of the Chief Judge as expressed in *Ex parte Hicks*.

THE BALLOT ACT.

THE select committee appointed to inquire into the working of the existing machinery of parliamentary and municipal elections, with power to suggest amendments in the same, have agreed to the following report:—

Your committee, having considered that the reference to them limited the objects of their inquiry, and that the Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Act of 1872 remains in force until 1880, determined, as far as possible, to restrict their inquiry to the mechanical working of the machinery provided by the Ballot Act. No evidence has been taken by them as to the general influence of secret voting on the conduct of elections, and any statements incidentally made by witnesses on this head are to be regarded as forming no part of the report or proceedings of the committee.

Your committee have examined a number of witnesses well acquainted with the working of the existing system of elections, in counties, and in large and small boroughs, who have suggested a considerable number of explanations and amendments of the law. Your committee have also before them various judicial decisions and official circulars, which will be appended to this report, and which must be considered as forming part of the evidence before this committee.

Your committee recommend immediate legislation, which they think can be effected without difficulty, for the purpose of rendering clear the construction to be placed on the directions given to the voter for the marking of his paper contained in the Ballot Act, which have been the subject of contradictory decisions in the English, Scotch, and Irish courts. It is not necessary to refer to the *Athlone* case, in which the Irish judges took a view lying between those views of the Scotch and English courts, which your Committee will proceed to explain. In the case of *Haswell v. Stewart*, arising out of the election held on the 10th of February, 1874, for the Wigtown District of Burghs, the Court of Session, four Scotch judges being present, decided, giving many reasons for their decision, and incidentally deciding many difficult points which arise on the consideration of ballot-papers doubtfully marked, that it is essential to a valid vote that the ballot-paper be marked with a cross and not a mere line; that a ballot-paper marked with a cross to the left of the candidate's name must be rejected; that any substantive and separate mark on the face of the ballot-paper in addition to the cross, such as a superfluous cross, will render the vote null; and established many other similar disqualifications. The Scotch judges held that "the directions for the guidance of the voter" had the force of law, and they further, in their judgments, expressed the opinion that Parliament had designedly stated in the Act its intention as to the manner in which alone papers should be marked in order to prevent the possible identification of the voter at the counting of votes. On the other hand, in the case of *Woodward v. Sarsons*, the judges of the Court of Common Pleas in England dissented from these views, and, being of opinion that the "directions" were not obligatory, held that all ballot-papers which were so marked that the intention of the voter could be gathered should be held to be valid. Your committee find, by the evidence of several witnesses, that there is still some confusion, even in England, upon this point. Your committee entertain the opinion that no ballot-paper should be rejected unless it appears clearly to the returning officer that the obligatory portion of the Act has not been complied with, and that the marking of the ballot-paper in a manner not in accordance with the "directions" should not cause its rejection,

unless it appears to the returning officer that such departure from the directions has been for the purpose of identification, or would necessarily afford an opportunity for such identification being effected, or unless the returning officer is unable to determine for whom the voter intended to vote. Your committee strongly recommend the immediate passing of a short Bill, declaring the law to be in accordance with the judgment in the above-mentioned case of *Woodward v. Sarsons*, and giving effect to the opinion above expressed by your committee. Your committee further suggest that the Home Office should forward to every returning officer the case and judgment in *Woodward v. Sarsons*.

Several witnesses have recommended the adoption of a black ballot-paper, the square intended for the cross remaining white; these could be adopted without any change of the law and your committee believe that the use of them would simplify the act of voting. Returning officers might be informed that it is not contrary to law to still further lessen the liability of the voter to error by reducing the margins of the ballot-papers. Your committee, in printing a specimen of a black ballot-paper with their report, desire to add that, although it has been suggested that there might be difficulty in some small boroughs in printing such papers, it is at the discretion of the returning officers either to adopt them or not.

Not only are a certain proportion of the ballot-papers "void for uncertainty," but it also happens that some voters are disfranchised through the want of the official stamp upon certain of the papers. Some witnesses have recommended the abolition of the official stamp, and hold that the real check upon fraud lies in the counting the number of papers in each box and comparing that number with the presiding officer's return. Your committee are, however, not prepared to recommend the abolition of the official stamp, but think that it should be retained, at all events until the working of the present system has been further tested. Other witnesses have recommended the stamping of the papers in advance, coupled with a careful return of the number so stamped; but your committee are also inclined to believe that this system would be open to objection. It remains then to consider whether amendments of detail in the plan at present pursued should be recommended. Evidence has been given that at Manchester, at Horsham, and in some other places, no attempt was made to carry out the directions of the Ballot Act, that the presiding officers should recognize the official stamp on the back of each paper before it is put into the box. If the use of an official stamp is to be continued, your committee consider that the requirements of the Ballot Act should be carried out to the full; and as in boroughs where a great number of voters poll at one particular period of the day, there is a temptation to the presiding officers to neglect some of such requirements, your committee think that a Home Office circular to returning officers should touch this subject. It might be pointed out that in some boroughs, as, for instance, in Leeds, there are two clerks appointed to each station, one of whom stamps the ballot-papers, with one presiding officer, and one ballot-box only, for the whole polling-place, the presiding officer being stationed near the exit from the room; that this plan of taking the poll is legal, although apparently not contemplated by the framers of the Ballot Act, and that it may offer considerable advantages in some boroughs, or in parts of them. Under the Leeds system, the presiding officer performs no duties except keeping order in the room, and recognizing the official stamp on the back of each paper as it is put into the box. Any Home Office circular might also, with advantage, state that the shifting perforating stamping machine, much used by returning officers, is liable to fraudulent imitation, and that the percussion embossing machine tires the hands of those who use it to such an extent as to cause the marks made upon the papers to be often far too faint to be of any service. In using any of the machines, and especially the lever embossing machine, returning officers should be directed to caution the presiding officers appointed by them only to stamp the papers singly, each moment that it is issued. It has been suggested by some witnesses that a paper with a special watermark might be adopted as an additional precaution, or in substitution for the use of the official stamp, and that all the ballot-papers might be supplied from London and only printed locally. Your committee are of opinion that, considered as an additional pre-

caution, this change in the law would be unnecessary, so long as the official stamp is preserved; and that, considered as a substitution, it would not prevent the whole of the frauds against which the official mark is intended to guard. In general it must be observed with regard to the mark that in several municipal elections, and in, at least, one parliamentary election, the result has been affected, and the return challenged at great cost, on account of certain papers wanting the official stamp. It is clear that a dishonest presiding officer might, with practical impunity, disfranchise voters by pretending to stamp the papers instead of really stamping them; and experience would seem to show that it would be a mistake to imagine that in the hurry of polling many voters would for themselves detect the omission of the stamp upon their paper. It must also be noted that, while a comparatively small number of papers have in most elections been rejected for total want of the official stamp, a great number of papers, where embossing machines are in use, are counted, although so slightly stamped as to be no protection against fraud, and to be liable to be rejected by a judge on petition.

All the town clerks, under-sheriffs, and election agents who have appeared before your committee have been asked their opinion as to the existing special provision for illiterate voters. All but two were against it, and told your committee that the provision could be used for purposes of delay. From two to five minutes appear to be spent over each illiterate voter, and in some case fifteen minutes have been thus consumed. At this point the witnesses divide themselves into two classes, and your committee will proceed to state the opinion of each upon a point which will have to be carefully considered by Parliament. Sir Joseph Heron, town clerk of Manchester; Mr. Curwood, town clerk of Leeds; Mr. Mr. Rayner, town clerk of Liverpool; Mr. Thompson, a late Liberal candidate of Whitehaven; Mr. Lund, the chief Conservative agent at Whitehaven; Mr. Ellis, the returning officer of Hackney; and Captain Nolan, a member of your committee, stated that the special provision might be used as a means for discovering that men voted in accordance with promises already made, and that the special provision might be used, not only to delay voting, but also to facilitate bribery and intimidation. Mr. T. W. Gorst, who had acted as the chief Conservative agent in Chelsea at the general election, and who had also been present at the counting of votes at Chatham, told your committee that hardly any voter in those boroughs had availed himself of the special provision, and Mr. Ellis made the same statement with regard to Hackney. The majority of the witnesses argue that the special provision is unnecessary, and that most of the illiterate voters would be able to discover for themselves the order of the candidates' names. On the other hand, Mr. John, the town clerk of Haverfordwest; Mr. Sedamore, the under-sheriff of Kent; Mr. Taylor, the town clerk of Flint; Mr. Shaw, the Conservative agent at Sheffield; Mr. Ramsbottom, a Conservative agent of great experience; and Mr. Bostock, the town clerk of Horsham, told your committee that, while they strongly disapproved the existing provision, they thought some special provision necessary, and most of them propose to substitute a mere verbal statement of inability to read for the present declaration. Mr. Hughes, the chief Conservative agent for Greenwich and for the City of London, alone expressed his satisfaction with the law as it now stands. Your committee advise that all special provisions for the assistance of illiterate voters should be abolished, and that no voters, save those who labour under some physical disability, should receive assistance in the marking of the ballot-papers.

In any general amendment of the Ballot Act it would, in the opinion of your committee, be desirable to afford an opportunity for curing any defects in relation to the nomination of candidates which may be pointed out by objection taken at a period of the nomination when it is, under the present system, too late to cure such defects.

In the case of the municipal nominations a difficult question arises when elections take place on the usual day—the 1st of November. Should a person signing the nomination of a councillor be on the old burgess list which is in force up to the 31st of October, and be a properly-qualified burgess at the time when the nomination is put in, but be omitted from the burgess list which comes in force on the day of the election, the 1st of November, is the nomination a good one? Conversely, if a nominator's name is upon the new list, but was not on the old list which was in

force when the nomination was put in? This point ought to be cleared up.

Coming to the provisions for the taking of a poll, your committee wish to point out that the law does not clearly lay down how many representatives the candidates may appoint. It is doubtful whether in municipal elections they have a distinct right to appoint representatives at all. This power should be distinctly given them; and, as to both parliamentary and municipal candidates, provisions should be made by a clause in the Corrupt Practices Bill, the introduction of which in the present year has been promised, that each candidate should have the right to appoint one representative at each polling-station at which papers are delivered to voters. The clause might also prescribe the number of agents to be allowed to be present at the counting of the votes. These counting agents should take the declaration of secrecy, not, as at present, necessarily before the opening of the poll, but at any time before the commencement of the counting. Your committee are further of opinion that the declaration of secrecy should be maintained, and that candidates should be directed to take that declaration in all cases in which they intend to enter a polling-booth, or to attend the counting of votes.

Your committee are of opinion that in any possible future amendment of the general provisions of the Ballot Act it should be enacted that where the counting does not take place immediately after the close of the poll, or where it is interrupted after it has once been begun, the ballot-boxes and documents forwarded by the presiding officers shall be placed in some public building, and either guarded by the police or protected by the sealing of all the issues from the room in which they have been placed with the seals of such of the candidates or their agents as shall demand such precaution. R. 34 of the 1st schedule of the Ballot Act, and r. 37, taken together, show that it is at present law that the number of papers from each polling station should be checked at the close of the counting. Mr. T. W. Gorst and Mr. Scudamore have pointed out that the usual practice is to check these at the beginning of the counting, and your committee are of opinion that the law might properly be altered so as to accord with the existing practice. Your committee do not think it would be wise to tie down returning officers to one mode of counting, that mode being prescribed by statute, but that the best mode of carrying out the counting of the votes might, with advantage be described in the Home Office circular which they contemplate. The plan pursued at Leeds has been explained by Mr. Curwood to the committee, and the very similar method followed at Liverpool will be found explained in appendix No. 5. The object which should be held in view by returning officers, but which is sometimes forgotten, is to sort the papers, after they have been mixed, into all possible combinations, that there should be a check, by any easy process of addition, upon the results of the actual count itself. It should be provided that, at the close of the counting, every returning officer should send to the Home Secretary a return showing, in tabular form, the number of electors on the register, the number of voters who received a paper, the number of ballot-papers found, the number of votes allowed, the number of votes out of these which are those of illiterate by declaration, so long as on this point the law remains unchanged, the number of votes rejected, specifying also as to these last the number there are bad, for each of the four following causes:—

1. Want of official mark.
2. Voting for more candidates than entitled to.
3. Containing writing or mark by which voter can be identified.
4. Being unmarked, or void for uncertainty.

Under r. 42 of the 1st schedule of the Ballot Act, it appears to have been contemplated by Parliament that the copies of the register showing what persons had applied for papers should be open to inspection; but it is clear that the combined effect of rr. 29, 37, 38, and 41, is to take away the right of inspection. With the view to restore this right, your committee recommend that r. 29 should be so altered as to direct the keeping separate of the marked register, instead of its being sealed up with the counterfoils. Your committee further advise that more distinct provision should be made for the destruction of the ballot-papers and other documents relating to municipal elections.

The last recommendation of your committee is that, in any future general amendment of the law relating to parlia-

mentary elections, provision should be made for payment of the charges incurred by the local authority in making or altering polling districts.

General Correspondence.

* * "A SOLICITOR" seems to write under a misapprehension. The meeting referred to in the paragraph our correspondent has seen was proposed to be called to express disapproval of the circular.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. JOHN TREVOR DAVIES, solicitor, of Sherborne and Yeovil, has been appointed Clerk to the County Magistrates of the former place, in succession to the late Mr. John Young Melmoth. Mr. Davies was admitted a solicitor in 1869.

Mr. JOHN COPSON FOWKE, solicitor, of Birmingham, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking Affidavits to be used in any Court of Record in the Province of Quebec in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HENRY BURKE GODWIN, solicitor, has been elected Town Clerk of Newbury, in the place of Mr. Robert Fuller Graham resigned. Mr. Godwin was admitted a solicitor in 1857, and is clerk to the county and borough magistrates and Commissioners of Taxes, and secretary to the Charity Trustees for Newbury.

Mr. EDWARD STAFFORD HOWARD, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the Eastern Division of the County of Cumberland in the Liberal interest, is the second son of the late Mr. Philip Howard, of Greystoke, Cumberland, and was born in 1851. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (where he graduated in the third class of the classical tripos in 1873), and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1875.

Mr. SAMUEL JELFS, solicitor's clerk, of Sherborne, has been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes at that place, in succession to the late Mr. John Young Melmoth.

Mr. ALFRED FRASER LINGHAM, barrister, of Calcutta, has been appointed First Judge of the Small Causes Court at Rangoon, in succession to Mr. Donald Grant Macleod. Mr. Lingham was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1868.

Mr. DONALD GRANT MACLEOD, barrister, has been appointed Judge at Moulmein, in the place of Lieutenant-Colonel Duff. Mr. Macleod is an LL.B. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1865. He was formerly on the Home Circuit, and has been for some time First Judge of the Small Causes Court at Rangoon.

Mr. ODDEN FREDERICK READ, solicitor, coroner for the borough of Thetford, has been appointed Registrar of the Mildenhall County Court, Clerk to the Mildenhall Highway Board, and Clerk to the Mildenhall, Burnt Fen, and Lakenheath and Hockwold Road Trustees, in succession to his late father, Mr. James Read.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY TOLLER, solicitor, has been appointed a Magistrate for the Borough of Barnstaple. He was admitted a solicitor in 1864, and is clerk to the Barnstaple Board of Guardians, and to the Taw and Torridge Fishery Conservators. He is in partnership with his father, Mr. John Henry Toller, who is deputy-coroner for the county and clerk of the peace for the borough.

Mr. JOHN WEBSTER, solicitor, has been appointed a Magistrate for the Borough of Sheffield. Mr. Webster was admitted a solicitor in 1835. He has been twice elected mayor of the borough, and was until recently one of the coroners for Yorkshire.

Mr. W. H. WHITFIELD, of the firm of Walker, Twyford, Selward, & Whitfield, of 5, Southampton-street, Bloomsbury, has been appointed Clerk to the Local Board for the District of Wimbledon, Surrey. Mr. Whitfield was admitted in Hilary Vacation, 1873, after having obtained a prize of the Incorporated Law Society at his final examination.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the last weekly meeting of this society, held at the Law Institution, on the 25th inst., Mr. C. Swinfen Eady in the chair, the question discussed was:—"Bequest of the surplus of a sum of money after satisfaction of a purpose which fails. There are data for an inquiry as to how much would have been required to satisfy the purpose which fails. Is the bequest void?" Mr. T. C. Russell opened the question in the affirmative, followed by Mr. J. L. Lawrence in the negative. The question was finally answered in the negative by a majority of seven.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

On Wednesday the half-yearly meeting of this Association was held in the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane; Mr. Frederiek H. Janson in the chair. The thirty-sixth half-yearly report of the directors was read. It was as follows:—

The termination of the half-year marks the arrival of the period at which, under the 16th rule of association, the directors are to record their statement of its work and progress, conformably with which rule the board have now the pleasure of presenting this their thirty-sixth half-yearly report.

The progress of the association during the past six months, taken as compared with that of either of the two previous half-years, has not been less satisfactory in respect of the increase of its numbers, the new members added having been sixty-two, while in the corresponding half of the previous year the number was fifty-seven, and in the later half fifty-eight.

But, looking at this association in contrast with the large and influential profession with which it is connected, the directors cannot help feeling that the great numerical disproportion existing between the two is matter for regret; for whether this association be regarded as an institution for purely charitable purposes, or in its narrower, but not less commendable phase, as a means of effecting a wise provision against possible adversity, it may be said to appeal with equal force to the sympathy and support of every member of the profession; and its present condition, after eighteen years of work and appeal, seems to speak less cogently than might be desired for the unanimity of the profession in support of objects affecting their common welfare, particularly when it is considered that the number of practising solicitors in England and Wales is considerably over 10,000, and only 2,324 (not one-fourth) are members of this association. The board venture, however, to think that much may be done for the association, if members themselves will, as opportunities offer, kindly canvass their surrounding brethren who are not members, and endeavour to infuse into them a little of that interest which they themselves feel. This has been tried with good results by individual members in such towns as Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, Bristol, Norwich, and Exeter, and the board will very much appreciate any services rendered to the association in this way.

Of the above-mentioned aggregate number of solicitors enrolled as members of this association, 891 are life members and 1,433 annual. Thirty-seven life members are also annual contributors of sums ranging from one to five guineas.

The directors are glad to state that the recent annual circulation of the reports of the association, a copy of which has been sent to every member of the profession, has tended to increase the number of members, and they believe it may be assumed that there are still many solicitors who, if personally applied to by local friends, will feel it no less a pleasure than a duty to evince their sympathy for their professional kindred by subscribing.

It will be seen by the audited abstract of the accounts appended that the receipts of the association during the past half-year have been £1,846 11s. 5d.

With the advancing growth of the association, the applicants for its assistance become, as may be supposed, more numerous, and during the past half-year, in that which may be termed the primary class of cases, including members and their families, fourteen applications were received by

the board, two of them being from necessitous members, and the remainder from the widows and families of members deceased. Among these applicants, some of whom had received previous assistance from the association, the board distributed, as will be seen by the balance-sheet, a sum of £540 in grants varying in amount from £20 to £50, according to the circumstances. Twenty-seven applications coming under the secondary class, or families of deceased non-members, were also received, and among these the board distributed a sum of £240 in grants varying from £5 to £15 each, making in the whole a sum of £780 applied to purposes of relief during the half-year.

A sum of £479 2s. was invested in the purchase of Three per Cent. Reduced Annuities; and the entire invested capital now amounts to £31,507 stock, consisting of £7,000 Three per Cent. Consols; £1,350 Three per Cent. Reduced Annuities; £8,000 India Five per Cents.; £11,000 India Four per Cents.; £3,907 London and North-Western Railway Four per Cent. Perpetual Debenture Stock; and £250 London and St. Katharine Docks Four per Cent. Debenture Stock, producing together annual dividends amounting to £1,245.

A balance of £330 8s. 8d. remained to the credit of the association with the Union Bank of London, at the date of the account (the 29th of February last), and a sum of £15 was in the secretary's hands.

The directors regret to have to record the decease of two of their esteemed colleagues since the last meeting:—Mr. John James Simpson, of Derby, and Mr. William Brooks Gates, of Northampton; which vacancies they have not yet filled up.

The board, in conclusion, have pleasure in stating that the ensuing anniversary festival of the association is appointed to take place on Wednesday, the 21st of June next, at the Albion Tavern, London, under the presidency of Lord George Francis Hamilton, M.P. for Middlesex, and as the sole object of the festival is to promote the interests of the association, the directors venture to hope for the kind and valuable co-operation of their brother members throughout the kingdom, to enable them to render the occasion as beneficial as possible in its results.—(Signed on behalf of the Board)

FREDK. H. JANSON, Chairman.

The report was adopted.

Mr. JOHN DRUMMOND moved "That the resolution passed at the general meeting on the 22nd of October, 1874, 'That in the opinion of that meeting it was desirable that in any future festivals the invitations should be confined to solicitors,' be re-considered, and that such restriction be henceforth withdrawn." The speaker argued that the restriction was founded on a false sentiment of pride and dignity, and that the distinction made between barristers and solicitors was unreasonable and unnecessary.

Mr. CHUBB seconded the motion.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that there was no exclusion of barristers now. They could be introduced by any friend. The only difference made was, that the barristers were not officially invited.

Mr. CHUBB thought that the distinction was an unwise one in the interests of the charity, and ought to be abolished.

Mr. ROSCOR suggested that the restriction referred to might be accounted for by the peculiar relations which existed between the bar and the solicitors. Of course there could be no personal objection to the presence of the members of the bar at their annual festivals.

Mr. A. C. VELY doubted whether it would be wise for a comparatively small meeting to reverse a resolution passed at a fuller one.

After some further discussion Mr. Drummond's motion was declared to be carried.

With reference to the fees of the official referees, the *Chicago Legal News* says:—"We in America would complain most bitterly if we had to pay over five dollars an hour for the fees of a referee or court commissioner, and, when the reference is out of the city, the expenses of the referee and his clerk. Even the United States district judges, when holding court out of their districts, do not get their expenses paid or any additional compensation."

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 24.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.

The House went into committee on this Bill, resuming the consideration of clause 14.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved the omission of the words "corn, rice, paddy, pulse, seeds, nuts, or nut kernels," and the substitution of the words "grain cargo."—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved an amendment to substitute for the general provision that cargoes should be prevented from shifting by the use of "boards, bulkheads, or otherwise" a specific provision that boards of 2½ in. in thickness should run from the keelson or screw tunnel longitudinally throughout the part of the ship so loaded, and up to the underside of the planking of the deck next above the top of such grain cargo, and that not less than one-fourth of such grain cargo should be in sacks or bags laid upon the surface of the remaining three-fourths of the cargo loaded in bulk.—The amendment was withdrawn.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved an amendment in order to make "managing owners" as well as "masters" of ships responsible for allowing cargoes or parts of cargoes to be shipped for carriage contrary to the provisions of the clause.—The amendment was agreed to, the word "agents" having been added.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved to insert the word "grain" before "cargo" in the clause.—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. PLIMSOLL moved the insertion of words to provide that masters of ships carrying into, or loading in, any port of the United Kingdom grain cargoes contrary to the provisions of the clause should be subject to the penal provisions of the Bill.—The amendment was withdrawn.—Sir H. JAMES moved to insert after the word "exceeding" the following words:—"£300, to be recovered on summary conviction."—The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 15 (deck cargoes), Mr. PLIMSOLL moved to omit the words "if any ship, British or foreign," in order to insert the words "No British ship."—Upon a division the amendment was rejected by 108 to 75.—Lord ESINGTON moved the insertion of words excluding from the payment of dues for deck cargo all "home trade ships as defined by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854," instead of ships trading within "the limits of the United Kingdom and the Isle of Man."—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. ASHLEY moved the omission of the word "timber."—On a division the amendment was rejected by 101 to 91.—Lord ESINGTON proposed the omission of the word "stores."—The amendment was negatived.—Mr. E. SMITH moved to omit the parenthesis,—"not being exempted goods herein-after mentioned").—The amendment was agreed to.—Lord ESINGTON moved the insertion of the words "in respect of the period during which such goods are on board." The amendment was negatived.—Sir A. LUSH proposed in page 9, line 3, after the word "tonnage," to insert "double," on the ground that single tonnage dues were too small, but that to double or treble the amount would do something to discourage deck-loading.—The amendment was withdrawn.—Mr. E. SMITH moved the omission of the sub-section which provided that if the goods were carried in a covered-in space, the whole of that space should be taken into account in calculating additional tonnage.—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS moved the insertion of words providing that dues payable in respect of space added to a ship on account of deck cargo should be payable only for and during the time such deck cargo was carried on board.—The amendment was withdrawn.—The motion that the clause stand part of the Bill was carried on a division by 95 to 58.

Progress was then ordered to be reported.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (Nos. 2 AND 3).
These Bills passed through committee.

TREASURY SOLICITOR.

This Bill was read a second time.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was immediately reported.

April 26.—WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL.

Mr. FORSYTH moved the second reading of this Bill.—On a division it was lost by 239 to 152.

SALE OF COAL.

Mr. GOURLEY brought in a Bill to regulate the sale of coal in the provinces.

CHELSEA HOSPITAL.

Mr. CAVE brought in a Bill to extend the Exchequer and Audit Act of 1866 to the accounts of Chelsea Hospital.

KINGSTOWN HARBOUR.

Mr. W. H. SMITH in a Bill further to amend the Acts relating to Kingstown Harbour.

Law Students' Journal.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

The following examiners for 1876-1877 were elected at the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday:—

Jurisprudence, Roman Law, Principles of Legislation, and International Law.—Professor Edwin Charles Clark, LL.D., M.A., and Frederic Harrison, Esq., M.A.

Equity and Real Property Law.—Edward Fry, Esq., B.A., Q.C., and Alexander E. Miller, Esq., LL.D., Q.C.

Common Law and Law and Principles of Evidence.—Henry Matthews, Esq., LL.B., Q.C., and Alfred Wills, Esq., LL.B., Q.C.

Constitutional History of England.—Professor Sheldon Amos, M.A., and Sir Edward S. Creasy, M.A.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

EASTER EXAMINATION, 1876.

General Examination of Students of the Inns of Court, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th of April, 1876.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to Newman Lesingham Bailey, Walter Talbot Cairns, Edwin Flynn, Charles Edmund Fox, Thomas Austin Guerin, David Brynmor Jones, and Framjee Rustumjee Vicarjee, of the Middle Temple; William Charles Arlington Blow, Archibald Henry Boyd, Thomas Willes Chitty, James Douglas Cochran, George Cooper, Charles Agace Ferard, Henry Thomas Hyde, Richard Willis Jameson, Johannes Henricus Lange, Charles Henry Lomax, Roger Campbell Lyall, John Molesworth Macpherson, William Thomas Martin, Frederick Peters, Archibald Weyland Ruggles-Brise, Grij-a Sanker Sen, Percy Vere Turner, and Henry Woolcombe, of the Inner Temple; and Frederick Charles Aplin, John Ward Baines, Charles George Orlando Bridgeman, Lewis Tonna Dibdin, Alfred Clarke Edwards, Frank Evans, Arthur Matheson Fraser, Harold Freeth, Charles T. Alanyffe, George Stuckey Loan, Frederic William Maitland, James Marshall, Frederick Lechmere Paton, James Trustram, Alfred Charles Tufton, Arthur Woollgar Verrall, and Hubert Winstanley, of Lincoln's-inn, certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman Civil Law only:—P. B. Adams, R. U. Ahmed, P. Arnould, and T. Bate, Esqs.; the Hon. F. A. Ker Bennet; H. H. M. Bindon, J. E. Bridges, T. F. Byrne, A. M. Cardwell, W. H. A. Christie-Miller, D. A. V. Colt-Williams, W. R. Court, C. J. F. Faulder, A. W. Fitzroy, R. Ghosh, G. B. Gipp, W. O. Goldschmidt, C. Harris, A. R. Harding, T. M. Horsfall, J. Heywood, C. W. Imrie, R. G. Janion, T. T. D. Jefferson, H. B. Jones-Bateman, C. P. McKeand, T. H. Kekewich, J. W. Leahy, L. E. Lawford, C. E. Lloyd, A. P. Lousada, S. Lynch, T. Macdonald, T. A. F. Maitland, W. G. Marshall, E. M. Micholls, H. Y. Musgrave, E. B. Nelson, T. M. F. Parkyn, F. J. N. Pearson, L. S. Porter, E. S. M. Pryce, W. J. Richardson, J. W. Robinson, E. Satow, F. T. Saunders, H. G. C. Stapylton, A. Thompson, and G. A. Vennell, Esqs.

overflow." It seemed to him that if a man staved off water during an "extraordinary" flood from his grounds, no action was maintainable so long as he only reared a barrier for the simple purpose of preserving his property from loss, and maintained it only so long as was necessary. It should be remembered, however, that the law laid down in clear terms a reverse view should the flood be one that was, in a manner, customary.

Legal News.

On Tuesday the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas said it would be convenient after circuit to give the first four days to motions and new trials. At the end of that time days would be fixed for the new trials.

Here is a little point in which they manage matters better in France. At the close of the special session of the Assize Court at Paris, held for the trial of the prisoners accused of frauds in relation to the *octroi*, the jury, with their foreman at their head, says the *Gazette des Tribunaux*, waited upon the president of the court, and tendered their respectful congratulations on the manner in which he had conducted the difficult discussions in that long and laborious matter.

On Monday last, in the House of Commons, Colonel Nagten asked the Attorney-General if he could devise some means whereby, when there were no prisoners for trial at quarter sessions, as was the case at the city sessions at Winchester this month, the mayor might counter-order the summonses to jurymen to prevent their being called away from their avocations for no purpose. The Attorney General said he could not devise any means of accomplishing the object which the hon. and gallant gentleman had in view except by resorting to legislation, and he did not think this was a matter on which it was necessary to legislate.

The *Hour* thus describes the recent moot at Gray's Inn:—In response to a general invitation to the members of all the Inns, a large muster of barristers and students attended the "moot." Those who spoke wore their gowns, and for all persons present pens, ink, and paper were provided. The appearance of the hall at the opening of the meeting was that of a law court in full working order. The subject for the night's "moot" was set down thus on cards which were handed to the visitors: "A. had factory premises adjoining a watercourse which was a natural stream, and B. had similar premises also adjoining the watercourse lower down the stream. An extraordinary rainfall flooded the adjacent lands, and the water found its way into the watercourse above A.'s premises, and caused a very unusual quantity of water to flow down the watercourse. B., in order to protect his premises, which would otherwise have been flooded and injured, erected a temporary barrier, whereby the flow of the flood water was impeded, and the swollen water above thrown into A.'s factory, which was thereby substantially damaged. Is B. liable for such damage in an action against him by A.?" In opening the proceedings the president, Mr. F. T. Streeten, said that they were not met for mere talking or discussion. The object in view was that young lawyers might examine carefully into legal questions, and bring the results of those examinations into practice in their addresses there. If thoughtful study and scrutiny, and an earnest attentiveness were given to the subjects brought before them, the speakers and listeners attending these meetings could not help deriving valuable profit from them. Mr. Waite opened the pleadings, quoting many authorities with the object of proving that there was ground of action against the defendant B. Mr. Willis followed. Two other barristers, Messrs. Mozley and Ball, then advocated the cause of the defendant as at an ordinary trial. Mr. Streeten, having ascertained that no one else desired to advance further comments, summed up the arguments and finally brought the "moot" to an end by giving it as his opinion that few of the cases cited dealt with the question of an "extraordinary

Court Papers.

FEES AND PER-CENTAGES.

ORDER AS TO THE FEES AND PER-CENTAGES which are required to be taken in the Supreme Court of Judicature by means of Stamps.

April 22, 1876.

Whereas by section 26 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, it is provided that the fees and per-centages appointed to be taken in the High Court of Justice and in the Court of Appeal, and in any court to be created by any commission, and in any office which is connected with any of those courts, or in which any business connected with any of those courts is conducted, shall, except so far as they be otherwise directed, be taken by means of stamps; and further, that such stamps shall be impressed or adhesive, as the Treasury may from time to time direct; and that the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor, may from time to time make such rules as may seem fit for publishing the amount of the fees and regulating the use of such stamps, and particularly for prescribing the application thereof to documents from time to time in use or required to be used for the purposes of such stamps, and for insuring the proper cancellation of such stamps, and for keeping accounts of such stamps.

And whereas, by an order made under the same section of the said Act, on the 28th day of October, 1875, it was (amongst other things) provided that the stamps to be used in the collection of the fees and per-centages therein mentioned should, until further notice, be either impressed or adhesive as directed in any previous order, and in cases to which no previous order was applicable should be either impressed or adhesive, at the option of the parties by whom the fees were payable, and it was also provided that up to the beginning of the sittings on the 25th day of April, 1876, the adhesive stamps used before the publication of the said order in the Courts of Chancery and common law should be available, and might be used, in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

And whereas it is expedient to further extend the use of the same stamps, and to make other provisions in lieu of, and in addition to, those contained in the said order of the 28th day of October, 1875.

Now, we, the undersigned, being two of the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, do, with the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor, hereby give notice and order and direct:—

1. That from and after the 25th day of April, 1876, the stamps used for denoting the said fees and per-centages shall be of the character, and be applied and otherwise dealt with, as prescribed by the schedule hereto.
2. That the adhesive stamps at present in use in the Supreme Court of Judicature shall continue to be used so long as they are supplied by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue.
3. That in any case in which a deposit on account of probable fees and expenses is required, the following regulations shall be observed:—

As to Deposits.

- (a.) The party, or his solicitor, from whom under any order as to court fees a deposit may be required, shall, before the matter or cause be proceeded with, present for the signature of the officer of the court requiring the deposit, a certificate, duly stamped, for the amount of such deposit. Forms of certificates provided by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue may be obtained at the Inland Revenue Office, Somerset House, or at such other places as the commissioners may appoint.
- (b.) When the fees and expenses are ascertained, the said officer of the court shall indorse upon the said certificate the amount thereof.
- (c.) If the amount is in excess of the deposit, the certificate, bearing an additional stamp equal to the excess, must be produced to the said officer before he delivers his judgment or award, or gives his decision in the matter or cause.
- (d.) If the amount of the fees and expenses is less than the deposit, the holder of the certificate may obtain repayment of the difference upon presenting the certificate so indorsed at the Inland Revenue Office, Somerset House.

THE SCHEDULE above referred to.

Summonses, Writs, Commissions, and Warrants.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
On sealing a writ of summons for commencement of an action	Writ of summons	Impressed or adhesive	{ Forms of writ with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by Law Stationers
On sealing a concurrent, renewed or amended writ of summons for commencement of an action			
On sealing a notice for service under Order XVI., rule 18	Notice	Impressed or adhesive	Forms with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by Law Stationers
On sealing a writ of mandamus or injunction	Præcipe left at time of issuing writ	{ Impressed ...	{ Præcipes with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by Law Stationers
On sealing a writ of subpoena not exceeding three persons			
On sealing every other writ	Summons	Impressed ...	A form of summons will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by Law Stationers
On sealing a summons to originate proceedings in the Chancery Division			
On sealing a duplicate thereof	Duplicate summons	Impressed	
On sealing a copy of same for service	Copy of summons	Impressed or adhesive	
On sealing or issuing any other summons or warrant	Summons	Impressed or adhesive	
On sealing or issuing a commission to take oaths or affidavits in the Supreme Court	Commission	Impressed ...	Forms of commission with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office
Every other commission	Commission	Impressed ...	{ The commission or the copy of petition to be written on impressed paper, or the document to be produced at the Inland Revenue to be stamped.
On marking a copy of a petition of right for service	Copy of petition	Impressed ...	

Appearances.

The fee payable on entering an appearance to be denoted by an impressed stamp on the form of memorandum as prescribed by the appendix to the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, and where the appearance of more than one person is entered by the same memorandum, the fees for all persons

beyond the first to be denoted by means of impressed or adhesive stamps.

Forms of memorandum of appearance with the impressed stamp for one or more defendants will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by law stationers.

Copies.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.
For a copy of a written deposition of a witness to enable a party to print the same	Copy	Impressed or adhesive
For examining a written or printed copy, and marking same as an office copy ...	Copy	Impressed or adhesive
For making a copy and marking same as an office copy	Copy	Impressed or adhesive
For a copy in a foreign language	Copy	Impressed or adhesive
For a copy of a plan, map, section, drawing, photograph, or diagram	Præcipe or copy	Impressed or adhesive
For a printed copy of an order, not being an office or certified copy	Copy	Impressed or adhesive

Attendances.

The fees payable under this heading to be denoted either by an impressed or adhesive stamp on the subpoena, notice, or other document requiring the attendance of the officer.

additional fee per diem after the first to be taken by means of a præcipe with the impressed stamp, filed in the department from which the officer is summoned.

If the officer's attendance be required beyond one day, the

Oaths, &c.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For taking an affidavit or an affirmation or attestation upon honour in lieu of an affidavit or a declaration, except for the purpose of receipt of dividends from the Paymaster-General, on which no fee is payable	Affidavit or other document answering thereto	Impressed or adhesive	

	Document to be Stamped and Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
And in addition thereto, for each exhibit therein referred to and required to be marked	Stamp to be impressed or adhesive on exhibit if practicable, but if not to be impressed on præcipe filed	

Filing.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
On filing a special case or petition of right ...	Special case petition of right or præcipe	Impressed ...	Where practicable, stamp to be on special case or petition of right, and in other cases on præcipe filed
On filing an affidavit with exhibits (if any) annexed, submission to arbitration, award, bill of sale, warrant of attorney, cognovit, bail satisfaction piece, and writ of execution with return	Document filed ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On filing a scheme pursuant to the statute 30 & 31 Vict. c. 127, or the Liquidation Act, 1868	Scheme ...	Impressed	
On filing a caveat ...	Caveat ...	Impressed	

Certificates.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For a certificate of appearance or of a pleading affidavit or proceeding having been entered, filed, or taken, or of the negative thereof	Certificate ...	Impressed or adhesive	Forms of certificate with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office and by law stationers

Searches and Inspections.

The fees on searches and inspections to be taken by means of impressed stamps on a form which will be issued at the Inland Revenue Office and sold there, and by law stationers.

Examination of Witnesses.

The fees under this heading may still be denoted by means of adhesive stamps, which may be affixed either to the deposition or to the order or application paper for examination.

Hearing.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For entering or setting down, or re-entering or resetting down, an appeal to the Court of Appeal, or a cause for trial or hearing in any court in London or Middlesex, or at any assizes, including a demurrer, special case, and petition of right, but not any other petition, nor a summons adjourned from chambers	In the Registry Office, Chancery Division, on forms provided for the purpose At offices of Associates on copy of pleadings At all other offices of the High Court or Court of Appeal on præcipe	Impressed ... Impressed or adhesive Impressed	Forms, with the impressed stamp, will be sold at the Inland Revenue, and at the Registrar's Office, Chancery Division
For certificate of an associate of the result of trial	Certificate ...	Impressed or adhesive	

Judgments, Decrees, and Orders.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For drawing up and entering a judgment, or decree or decretal order, whether on the original hearing of a cause or on further consideration, including a cause commenced by summons at Chambers, and an order on the hearing of a special case or petition, and any order by the Court of Appeal	Judgment or order	Stamp to be impressed or adhesive on the judgment or order, except at the Crown Office, where, as far as practicable a præcipe, with the impressed stamp, should be used	
For drawing up and entering any other order, whether made in Court or at Chambers	Order ...	Impressed or adhesive	
For copy of a plan, map, section, drawing, photograph, or diagram required to accompany any order	Copy ...	Impressed or adhesive	Where an adhesive stamp would damage the copy, a præcipe with the impressed stamp, should be used

Taking Accounts.

The fees payable under this heading when taken on the accounts to be denoted by means of adhesive stamps affixed to the accounts or by impressed stamps on paper to be left at the office, but when taken on a certificate they may be denoted either by impressed or adhesive stamps.

Taxation of Costs.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For taxing a bill of costs ...	Stamp to be adhesive on bill of cost, but where a certificate, allocatur, or præcipe is used, the fee to be denoted by impressed stamps	Impressed	
For a certificate or allocatur of the result, not being a judgment	Certificate or allocatur	Impressed	

Petitions.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For answering a petition for hearing in court and setting down	Petition ...	Impressed or adhesive	
For answering a non-attendable petition, not being a petition for an order of course	Petition ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On a matter of course order, on a petition of right	Order ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On an order for a commission on a petition of right	Order ...	Impressed	

Register of Judgments and Lis Pendens.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
For registering a judgment or lis pendens	Memorandum of registry	Impressed ...	Forms with the impressed stamp will be sold at the office of the Registrar of Judgments, Common Pleas Division
For re-registering same	General form of search præcipe Certificate		
For a certificate of entry of satisfaction			
For a certificate of a judgment for registration in Ireland or Scotland under the Judgments Extension Act, 1868, including affidavit			
On filing for registration a certificate issued out of courts of Dublin or Court of Session in Scotland under the same Act	Certificate ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On every certificate of the entry of a satisfaction under the same Act			
For a search made in one or both of the registers of Irish and Scotch judgments	Præcipe ...	Impressed ...	Forms of præcipe, with the impressed stamp, will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office, and by law stationers

Miscellaneous.

	Document to be Stamped.	Character of Stamp to be used.	Regulations and Observations.
On a report of a private Bill in Parliament	Report ...	Impressed	
On an allowance of bye-laws or table of fees	Allowance ...	Impressed	
On a fiat of a judge	Fiat ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On signing an advertisement	Advertisement ...	Impressed	
Upon a reference to a master of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, or Exchequer Divisions, for the purpose of any investigation or inquiry other than the taking of an account for which another fee is herein provided	Certificate or other document used in giving the decision	Impressed or adhesive	
On taking acknowledgment of a deed by a married woman	Acknowledgment	Impressed	Forms with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office
On taking a recognizance or bond	Recognizance ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On taking bail, and taking same off the file and delivering	Bail piece ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On a commitment	Commitment ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On an application to produce judges' notes	Application ...		
On appointment of commissioners under glebe exchange	Appointment ...	Impressed	
On examining and signing enrolments of decrees and orders	Enrolment ...	Impressed or adhesive	
On admission or re-admission of a solicitor	Admission ...	Impressed ...	Forms of admission with the impressed stamp will be sold at the Inland Revenue Office
On a written request for information at the Chancery Pay Office	Præcipe ...	Impressed	
For preparing a power of attorney at the Chancery Pay Office	Power ...		
For transcript of an account in the books at the Chancery Pay Office	Transcript ...	Impressed or adhesive	
Any other proceeding, pleading, or document, not hereinbefore specified	Document or præcipe	Impressed or adhesive	These are to be impressed if practicable where not filed in the office

General Directions.

In any case in which the use of impressed stamps is prescribed, paper or parchment on which the document requiring a stamp is to be written, may be stamped at the Inland Revenue Office, notwithstanding that stamped forms are also provided by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue.

The cancellation shall be effected in such manner as the

Commissioners of Inland Revenue shall from time to time direct.

CHICHTON.

J. D. H. ELPHINSTONE.

I concur in this Order,
CAIRNS, C.

COURT OF APPEAL.

CAUSE LIST FOR EASTER SITTINGS.

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

1876.

Wilson v Smith app of plt M.R. Feb 23 (S.O.)
 Patterson v The Gas Light and Coke Co app of deft V.C.B. Feb 26 (1 May)
 In re The European Assurance Society Arbitration Acts, and the Industrial and General Life Assurance and Deposit Co (Cocker's case) app of Matthew Cocker, from Lord Romilly—March 14
 In re The European Assurance Society Arbitration Acts, and the British Commercial Insurance Co (Rivington's case) app of joint official liquidator, from Lord Westbury—March 14
 In re The European Assurance Society Arbitration Acts, and the European and Life Insurance Annuity Co (Doman's case) app of joint official liquidator, from Lord Westbury—March 14
 Appleton v The Chapelton Paper Co app of deft Co M.R.—March 16 (not before 1 May)
 Colyer v Lee app of deft. V.C.B.—March 20
 In re W. S. Deighton's Settled Estates app of Jas. J. Wilks M.R.—March 23
 Meluish v Milton app of plt V.C.H.—March 24
 Attorney-Gen v Pagham Harbour Reclamation Co app of defts V.C.H.—March 25 (not before May 15)
 Mc Wade v Brodhurst app of plt in person V.C.H.—March 27
 Ellis v Local Board of Bromley app of the Local Board M.R.—March 27
 Sidebottom v Brooks app of plt V.C.M.—March 29
 Charter v Charter app of plt V.C.B.—March 31 (not before May 2)
 Gibbon v Fox app of plt V.C.B.—April 1
 Morgan v Elford app of the deft Thomas Elford V.C.M.—1 April
 Morgan v Elford app of deft Thomas E Crispe V.C.M.—1 April
 The Oystermouth Ry and Tramroad Co v Morris app of plt V.C.H.—April 4
 Maddy v Hale app of plt V.C.M.—April 6
 Smith v Webster app of deft V.C.M.—April 6
 Morris v Bradford app of deft V.C.B.—April 7
 Cunliffe v Branker app of plt M.R.—April 8
 Cooper v Cooper app of deft V.C.B.—April 8
 Judd v Green app of plt V.C.B.—April 12
 Anderson v Welsby app of deft J.G. Parker from V.C. of County Palatine of Lancaster (Liverpool District) April 20
 Wall v Dunn app of defts V.C.M.—April 20
 Pocock v Attorney-Gen app of plt V.C.H.—April 21

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions.

Hay v Motion app of deft from order dated 30 June, 1874—V.C.B. 17 July, 1875
 Hay v Motion app of deft from order dated 1 July, 1875—V.C.B. 17 July, 1875
 Mathias v The Wilts and Berks Canal Co (not before May 3 by consent) app of plt—V.C.M. 16 March 1876
 Gilbert v Smith app of defts—V.C.M. 11 April 1876
 Lewis v Carr app of plt from Exchequer Division 10 March, 1876
 Pacy and Wife v The London Tramways Co, limd, app of plt from Exchequer Division 4 April, 1876
 Ship M. Moxham No. 7,161 app of owners from Admiralty Division 29 March 1876

APPEALS FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

Morgan v Doulton restored on case as settled by Mr Justice Quain
 Whiteley v Taylor app of deft from Justices Blackburn, Lush, and Quain Feb 1
 Rawley v Rawley app of deft from L.C.J. and Justices Mellor and Field Feb 1
 Begbie v The Phosphate Sewage Co, limd app of plt from L.C.J. and Justices Mellor and Quain Feb 7
 Purnell v The Great Western Ry Co app of defts from Justices Blackburn and Lush Feb 8
 Polak and anr v Everitt app of plt from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Quain Feb 22
 Vestry of Mile End v Guardians of Whitechapel Union app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Lush, and Field Feb 22
 Marcus and anr v General Steam Navigation Co app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush Feb 23
 River Wear Commissioners v Adamson and anr app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Quain, and Archibald Feb 24
 Bentley v Lambert app of defts from Justices Blackburn and Lush Feb 24
 The Concordia Chemische Fabrik auf Actien v Squire app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush Feb 24
 The Naxos Emery Stone Co v Erlanger app of defts from L.C.J. and Justices Lush and Field Feb 24

Randall, Saunders, & Co v Thompson app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Lush, and Quain Feb 25

Rustomjee v Her Majesty the Queen app of suppliant (petition of right) from L.C.J. and Justices Blackburn and Lush Feb 29

The Queen v Steel and anr app of prosecutors from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush March 3 (order of court on Crown side)

Kynoch v Wilson app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Quain, and Field March 4 (Order on Special Case)

The Queen v Benjamin Collins app of deft from L.C.J. and Justices Mellor and Field March 8 (Order of the Court on Crown side)

Hudson v Tabor app of defts from Justices Blackburn and Lush March 25

Kopstov v Wilson and anr app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Quain, and Field April 21

APPEALS FROM THE COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

Lord Bateman v Thompson app of plt from Lord Coleridge and Justices Grove and Archibald Dec 2, 1875

Southwell v Bowditch app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Grove and Denman Feb 3

Rhodes and anr v The Airedale Drainage Commrs app of the Commrs from Lord Coleridge and Baron Amplett Feb 5

Wright (Clerk) v Davies (Clerk) app of plt from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Denman Feb 8

Richardson v The Great Eastern Ry Co app of Ry Co Feb 9 (special case entered by order)

Eastwood and anr (assignees, &c.) v Ward and anr app of defts from Lord Coleridge and Justices Denman and Lindley Feb 22

Okell and anr v Charles and anr app of plt from Justices Brett, Archibald, and Lindley March 2

Porter v Emmens app of deft from Justices Grove, Archibald, and Lindley March 2

Lord Hanmer v Flight app of deft from Justices Grove, Archibald, and Lindley March 3

Nelson v Lake app of plt from Lord Coleridge and Justices Archibald and Lindley March 4

Williams v The North China Insurance Co app of defts from Justices Brett, Archibald, and Lindley April 5

Republic of Peru v Weguelin and anr (No. 1) app of defts from Justices Brett, Grove, and Denman April 12

Same v Same (No. 2) ditto

Keary and anr v Fenwick and anr app of deft Fenwick, from Lord Coleridge and Justices Denman and Lindley April 20

Same v Same app of defts Armstrong and Stanley, from Lord Coleridge and Justices Denman and Lindley April 20

APPEALS FROM THE EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

Dawson v Fitzgerald app of defts from L.C.B. and Barons Bramwell and Pigott Dec 21

Edmonds v The Prudential Assurance Co app of plt from L.C. Baron Dec 21 (error on bill of exceptions under old practice by order)

Borrowman v Drayton app of defts from L.C. Baron and Barons Cleasby and Amplett Dec 23

Waring v Gill app of plt from L.C. Baron and Barons Cleasby and Amplett Dec 24

Earp v Faulkner and anr app of defts from L.C.B. and Barons Cleasby and Pollock Dec 31

Nicholls v Marsland app of plt from L.C.B. and Barons Bramwell, Cleasby, and Amplett Jan 4

Shell v Webster app of defts from Barons Bramwell, Cleasby, and Pollock Jan 8

Gadd v Houghton and anr app of defts from L.C. Baron and Barons Pollock and Huddleston Jan 20

Nathanson v Haarblicher and anr app of plt from Barons Cleasby and Amplett Jan 31

The Monmouthshire Ry and Canal Co v Bevan and anr app of defts from L.C. Baron and Barons Pollock and Huddleston Feb 2

Wooler and anr v Knott app of defts from L.C. Baron and Baron Huddleston Feb 18

Durant and anr v Robinson app of deft from Barons Bramwell, Amplett, and Huddleston March 1

Browning v Terrero app of deft from Barons Bramwell, Amplett, and Huddleston March 7

Andrew v Wood and anr app of plt from L.C.B. and Barons Pollock and Huddleston March 16

H. M. Atty-Gen v The Mutual Tontine Westminster Chambers Association, limd app of defts from L.C. Baron and Barons Bramwell and Cleasby March 18 (Error from Revenue side of Court of Exchequer)

APPEALS FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

Owners of the Cargo ex Woosung v Elton and anr app of Owners of Cargo ex Woosung from Sir R. J. Phillimore Feb 15

Ship City of Brooklyn 1876—O—No. 147.—Owners of the J. Mills and anr v Owners of the City of Brooklyn app of defts

from Sir R J Phillimore Feb 28 (to be heard with Nautical Assessors)
 Ship Victoria No 7,268 app of John Hall from Sir R J Phillimore March 1
 Ship General Birch.—Jardine v Ship Owners' Association of Christiana app of defts from Sir R. J. Phillimore March 8 (to be heard with Nautical Assessors)
 Ship Corinna 1875—O—No. 95.—Owners Master and Crew of the Mary Anns and ors v Owners of the Corinna and Freight app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore March 10 (to be heard with Nautical Assessors)
 Ship Limerick No 7,318 app of deft C T Jutson (Mortgagee) from Sir R J Phillimore April 10

APPEALS FROM THE LONDON COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

In re Cannot	Ex parte Turner
Ellis	Ellis
Partridge	Ingle
Marsden	Marsden
Appleby	Brown
Schroeder	Waddell
Urbani	Urbani
Zimmerman	British Seaweed Co
Harcourt	Watts
Tellwright	Tellwright
Tellwright	Whitehouse
Pitchford	Farmiloe
Pope	Pope
Stokoe	Moore
Carter	Carter

APPEALS FROM THE DIVISIONAL COURT OF APPEAL.

James Howes v The Board of Inland Revenue app of James Howes from Baron Cleasby and Justices Grove and Field Feb 17
 The Worcester Local Board of Health v The Guardians of Droitwich Poor Law Union app of the Droitwich Guardians from Baron Cleasby and Justice Field Feb 23
 The Tottenham Local Board of Health v Rowell (Executor of Michael Rowell, deceased) app of the Local Board from Baron Cleasby and Justice Field March 22
 N.B.—This list contains appeals and causes set down to April 22, inclusive.

Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Causes (with Witnesses).

Vickers v Brown c with wits, restored by order	Jones v Ford c trial
North British and Mercantile Insurance Co v Liverpool, London, and Globe Insurance Co c	Whiteley v Rothlisberger c trial
Beavis v Fordham c trial	Iaman v Wedderburn act trial
Union Bank of London v Pilcher c for trial	Compagnie Laferme v Hendrickx act trial
The London and Liverpool Hotel Co, limd v Wright c	Clayton v Clayton c
Barker v Whitehead c trial	Bickell v Bickell act trial
Pugh v Pryse c for trial	McCool v Wood c trial
Dicker v Angerstein c	Thwaites v Wyllson c trial
Witham v Taylor c for trial	Crofts v Baskcomb act trial
Taylor v Witham c for trial	Gordon v Gordon c
Wood v Barnicot c for trial	Gill v Whittingham c trial
Charles v Hughes c for trial (not before May 9)	(S O for sp ref's certe)
Hughes v Charles c for trial (not before May 9)	Lea v Millar c trial
Townsend v Haworth, 1874.—T.—105 c	Walton v Haynes c
Townsend v Haworth, 1875.—T.—15 c	Stones v Todd m d
Broome v Sheffield and Rotherham Bank c trial	Metcalf v Smith c trial
Broome v Duke c trial	Symes v Maynard c trial
Baily v Neale c trial	Meikle v Hunter c trial
Crosse v Heatly c trial	Woodhouse v Blakeley c trial
Hick v Schofield c	(pro confesso against deft Henry Woodhouse)
Sheldon v Cawley c trial	Bohmer v Warren act trial
Krahnen v Bertiner c trial	Cooper v Lloyd c trial (not before May 1)
Hallsworth v Spicer act trial	Fowke v Kemp act trial
	Pooley v Driver act trial
	Wright v Glover c trial
	Stothert v Prichard act trial
	Nagle-Gillman v Christopher c trial
	Hodges v Hodges act trial
	Harding v Sims c trial

Causes (without Witnesses).

Storey v Cresswell dem to statement of claim	European Assurance Society v Wareing act trial (short)
Wagstaff v Price m d (not before April 30)	Henderson v Maxwell act trial
Thompson v Prickard c trial	Longworth v Longworth f c
Smith v Mann c trial	Bennett v Smith m judgt
Allender v Allender sp c	Haigh v Haigh sp c
Caulfield v Caulfield sp c	Williams v Cockett f c

Blew v Marsh f c
 Oakley v Moulton act trial
 Greenep v Hunt sp c
 Hinks and Sons, limd v The Safety Lighting Co. limd c trial
 Broome v Stafford f c
 Willmer v Brice act trial
 Lucas v Dalziel c trial short
 Nicholls v Oliver m d
 Dixon v Harrison f c
 Lewis v Smith c trial short
 Woodall v Durnford c trial
 Thompson v Horner m judgt short
 Campbell v Holyland m judgt
 Dickinson v Parr m d
 Whitaker v Goodwin f c

Saull v Saull f c (transferred from V C Hall by order)
 Kesterton v Ruck c trial
 The Three Towns Banking Co, limd v Bellamy m d
 Hoppe v Hoppe c trial (short)
 Greenwood v Haigh m judgt
 Day v Stoward f c
 Van Eechout v Van Eechout f c (short)
 Edwards v Griffiths m judgt
 French v Sims f c
 Richards v Williams m judgt
 Republic of Bolivia v National Bolivian Navigation Co c trial
 Oliver v Edwards f c
 Jacobs v Jacobs act trial (short)
 Walter v Lucas act trial

Causes (Ineffective).

Dangerfield v Budd m d wits before exnr	Blackburn v Tayler m d wits before exnr
Young v Dale m d S.O. by order	Cardigan Iron, Steel, & Co limd v Angus m d wits before exnmr
Carrington v France m d wits before exnr	Chambers v Bridgman c trial (abated)
Gillespie v Goodridge m d S.O. by order	Teece v Welsh m d S O to amend
Budding v Murdock m d S.O. by order	The Bank of Castile v Olanivel c trial (Commission to examine wits abroad)
Baird v Moules's Patent Earth Closet Co c S.O. by order	Jolly v Ford f c (S.O. till Feb. 1877)
Lockwood v The Mutual Society m d wits before exnr	

N.B.—Causes and Actions in which Witnesses are to be examined before the Court will be taken on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, and Causes and Actions without Witnesses will be taken on Mondays, but when the List of Causes and Actions without Witnesses is exhausted, Causes and Actions with Witnesses will be taken on Mondays also.

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS.

Causes.

Shemwell v Rhodes dem to statement of defence (from Manchester District Registry)	sioners for England v The North-Eastern Ry Co c with wits
Jolliffe v Hayward c with wits, re-transferred from V C Bacon by order (May 15)	Ernest v Evans m d wits before exnr
Turner v Tepper m d pt hd	Dawkins v Dawkins c with wits
Hall v Tepper m d pt hd	Broad v Chapman m d
Scruton v Holt c (re-transfrd from M R by order)	Arthur v Smith m d
Holt v Scruton m d	Glover v Chancellor c, pro confesso
Spark v Lawrence c with wits	Blackburne-Maze v Gregory sp c
Bright v Tyndall sp c S O	Birch v Williams m d
Charlton v Miller c with wits	Farinel v Pol m d
Blaylock v Morton c with wits	Wight v Garrard c
Bull v The West London District School Board c with wits	Lawrence v Fletcher f c and sums to vary
Slipper v Gough m d	Greenwood v Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co c trial
Goody v Pearson m d	Hutton v May f c
Hutchinson v Turner m d	Skinner v Skinner f c
Quilter v Berridge m d	Ellis v Musgrove f c
Strousberg v Frankish c, set down by deft Frankish	Delves v Delves f c
Salamon v Sopwith m d, cross exam of deft Sopwith by order	In re Wilson, deceased, and Butcher v Simmons f c and sums to vary
Vallance v Vallance m d	Young v Young f c
Serjeant v Dear m d	Stranks v Coles f c
Ward v Pattison m d and Ward v Pattison f c, 1871—W—236, by order	Ryalls v Packman action for trial
Elder v Browning m d	Roberts v Shearwood f c
Smethurst v Smethurst m d	Palliser v Spyer c for trial
Butler v Butler cause, with wits	Wheatly v Davies f c
Stone v Bennett m d	Beales v Boyle m d with wits
Davis v Adams m d	Gilbert v Edean c for trial
Davis v Howard m d	Jones v Wynne c for trial
James v The Queen potn of right	Ungley v Ungley c for trial with wits
Rae v Vivers c with wits	Taunton v Morris c trial
Gibson v Head c with wits	Inglis v St Giles' Vestry, Camberwell action for trial
Hewitt v Brewster m d	Hilliard v De Loutay c trial
The Ecclesiastical Commis-	Widgery v Tepper m d pt hd
	Del Cacho v Barnett c for trial (not before May 10)

Tyler v Higgins f c
 Stacey v Stacey m d
 Stacey v Stacey 1873—S—41
 m d (restored by order)
 Parlett v Swayne c
 Dunbar v Aitken f c
 Chambers v Chambers f c
 Philipps v Philipps f c
 Clement v Clement c for trial
 Nicholls v Nicholls f c and
 sums to vary
 Cartwright v Last act trial
 Durham Building Society v
 Turnbull c with wits
 Sheffield v Sheffield c
 Suthers v Jubb f c
 Vane v Vane c
 Holdsworth v Davenport f c
 Mott v Mott f c
 Andrew v Enser f c
 Andrews v Greaves f c
 Watson v Hartness act trial
 Allen v Morgan f c
 Taylor v Campion f c
 Ponsford v Ritson c trial
 Newitt v Ambler f c
 Ashbee v Appleby c with
 wits
 Rowe v Gray act trial
 Earl of Powis v Strousberg
 m d
 Holmes v Grand Junction
 Canal Co act trial
 Hale v Adams—Rogers v
 Weston f c
 Franco v Raggett c trial
 Hedley v Dipton Gas Co, limd
 m d
 Thompson v Leggett m d
 Wilson v Hodgson c trial
 Jull v Jacobs f c
 South v White c for trial
 (transferred from County
 Court)
 Huxley v Huxley motn for
 judgt
 Meade v Meade c trial
 Matthews v Prest f c
 Emerson v Child c trial
 McQueen v Anderson c
 Growse v Frost f c

Morle v Willment act trial
 Lucas v Siggers f c and sums
 to vary
 Doucet v Geoghegan act trial,
 wits
 Scott v Thorn motn judgt
 Mainwaring v Wilbraham act
 trial
 Wickham v Heath f c
 Seligmann v Baron Colchester
 c trial
 Loder v Stone m d
 Bunnnett & Co, limd v Bunnnett
 c trial
 Whitehead v Tuson c trial
 In re Wright—Wright v Bone
 motn judgt (short)
 Brander v Harrison f c
 Brace v Brace f c
 Hedge v Morison c trial short
 Dunning v Berridge c trial
 Annesley v Mears a trial
 short
 Wells v Row f c
 Beale v Atchley f c
 Poltick v Cheesman f c
 In re Palfreyman—Marshall v
 Bingham a trial from Shel-
 field District Registry short
 McMillin v Duncombe f c
 Pritchard v Wright a trial
 from Nottingham District
 Registry
 In re Frubshaw—Claxton v
 Gardner m judt
 Pead v Pead m d
 Symonds v Jenkins c trial
 Instone v Instone f c
 Nunn v Nunn f c
 Kernick v Bamfield m judt
 Edwards v Clark a trial short
 Maugham v Maugham c
 trial
 Leigh v Leigh f c
 Davis v Beddington c trial
 short
 Kenney v Kenney f c
 Lax v Clever c trial
 Jackson v Tyas c trial
 Farrow v Austin c trial

Bigsby v Dickinson c for
 trial, wits (May 2)
 Vickers v Furniss f c
 Fullagar v Fullagar f c and
 sums to vary
 Verity v Verity f c
 Waldy v Waters c for trial
 Armitage v Gregson c trial
 (April 27)
 Teasdale v Braithwaite c for
 trial

Henderson v Henderson m
 for judt
 Johnson v Johnson a for trial
 with wits
 Jennings v Ingram a for trial
 Spratt's Patent v Booth a for
 trial
 In re Fryer—Martindale v Pic-
 quot f c from Chancery

CAUSES.

Transferred from the MASTER
 OF THE ROLLS, and the Vice-
 Chancellor Sir R. MALINS, by
 Order dated 4th April, 1876.

Taylor v Birkenshaw c trial
 (V C M)
 Davids v Dartin c trial with
 wits (V C M)
 The Berlin Phosphate, Sewage
 & Co limd v The Phosphate
 Sewage Co limd cause for
 trial, with wits (M R)
 Thornton v Wilson act trial
 with wits (M R)
 Owens v Emmens c with
 wits (V C M)
 Low v Goble c trial (V C M)
 Lewis v Smith c trial with
 wits (M R)
 Luckie v Fitzroy c trial
 (V C M)
 Cox v Watson motn for de-
 cree (V C M)
 Brown v Jones actn for trial
 (V C M)
 Montefiore v Gibbs c with
 wits (M R)
 Earp v Henderson act for
 trial with wits (M R)
 Gibson v Hey c trial with
 wits (M R)
 Brown v Burdett c trial with
 wits (V C M)
 Short v Millett c trial
 (V C M)
 Ebrey v Nelson act trial
 (V C M)
 Bower v Haley c with wits
 (V C M)
 Day v Freund act trial
 (V C M)
 Andrews v Davison c trial
 with wits (M R)
 Crossley v Cox c trial with
 wits (M R)
 Stringer v Stringer c (V C M)

Woolley v Woolley m d
 (V C M)
 Smith v London & Westmina-
 ster Loan & Discount Co limd
 c (V C M)
 G & J Brown & Co v Brown
 act trial with wits (M R)
 Brown v Brown & Co limd act
 trial with wits (M R)
 Alvarez v Barnard act trial
 with wits (M R)
 Evans v Harry act trial (M R)
 evid by affid (not before July
 4)
 Wohlgemuth v Compton c
 trial with wits (M R)
 Holste v Robertson c trial
 with wits (M R)
 Shaw v Thompson act trial
 with wits (M R)
 Capper v Chapman act trial
 with wits (M R)
 Deane v Mc Dowell c with
 wits (M R)
 Sargent v Read act trial with
 wits (M R)
 Barnicot v Hann c trial with
 wits (M R)
 Hillman v Mayhew act trial
 with wits (M R)
 The Widnes Metal Co v
 Norwood c trial with wits
 (M R)
 Shaw v Norwood c trial with
 wits (M R)
 Holcombe v Adams c trial
 with wits (M R)
 Digby v Floating Swimming
 Baths Co limd c trial
 with wits (M R)
 Wood v Edwards c trial
 with wits (M R)

End of Second Transfer.

Causes

Set down since Second Transfer.

Perrott v Davies f c sums to
 vary
 Boag v Boag c trial (short)
 Rose v Dormer f c

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir CHARLES HALL.

Causes.

Claridge v Arnold demr
 Republic of Peru v Ruzo m d
 (not before May 10)
 Hartmont v Heynemann c
 with wits
 Austin v Austin m d, wits
 before exmr
 Hodgson v Mayhew m d with
 wits
 The General Insurance Co v
 Kuhner c with wits (not
 before June 1)
 Boyd v Henderson c
 Wharton v Gardner c
 The New Westminster Brewery
 Co v Hannah c trial wits
 before exmr
 Hall v Byron c with wits
 Morgan v Birch c trial with
 wits
 Hopkins v Hopkins c trial
 Smith v Conder c trial S O
 Bell v Cockle m d
 Price v Jenkins m d wits be-
 fore exmr.

Clarke v Cookson c trial wits
 S O
 Burns v Irving m d pt hd
 Tittle v Ash c trial (not be-
 fore May 5)
 Marsden v Kent c trial wits
 Lewis v Webber c trial with
 wits
 Elworthy v Elworthy Brothers
 & Co, limd m d wits before
 exmr
 Harris v Staigt act trial
 The British Mutual Invest-
 ment Co v Smart c trial
 Perkins v Slater c trial
 John v Jones m judgt
 Laing v Harle c
 Culley v Battifant c, pro con-
 fesso
 Attorney-Gen v Mayor, &c, of
 Basingstoke c trial
 White v Mansell c trial
 Farquharson v Floyer f c
 Mills v Haywood m d
 Latch v Latch (35) m d

DIVISIONAL COURT OF APPEAL,
CHANCERY DIVISION.

Hill v Perse appl of deft from Westminster County
 Court February 5 stands over.

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir JAMES BACON.

Causes

Set down previous to transfer.

Thompson v Metcalfe m d, wits
 before exmr
 King v Corke c with wits
 (rest'd by order)
 Clark v Bullows m d (S.O)
 Palmer v Hall m d (M R) S O
 Bottle v Klocker m d (V C
 M)

Poyar v Southwood m d
 (V C M) wits before exmr
 Edwards v Noble c trial (pt
 hd S O)
 Vale v Oppert c with wits
 (S O)

REMAINING CAUSES

Transferred from the Vice-Chancellor Sir R. MALINS, by
 order dated February 7, 1876.

Roe v Davies m d with wits
 (not before May 22)
 Powell v Leeman m d (S.O.)
 Kenney v Potter c with wits
 Davies v Chatwood c with wits
 pt hd
 Wellman v Northover c trial
 Lascelles v Butt c trial with
 wits

Pratt v King c trial (not be-
 fore May 13)
 Wilmot v Forrest c trial with
 wits
 Fallows v The Knight, Tre-
 velyn, &c., Iron Ore Co,
 limd c with wits
 Pares v Pares c for trial

End of First Transfer.

Causes

Set down since First Transfer.

Firmstone v McKwen c
 Mackett v Herne Bay Com-
 missioners m d with wits
 Godwin v Tebb c trial with
 wits
 Attorney-Gen v The Cloth-
 workers' Co c trial (not be-
 fore May 5)

Wiltahier v Corbett m d
 Barrett v Vernon m d wits
 Bragg v Best c trial wits
 Bowman v Day act trial
 (April 28)
 Hough v Garrett c wits (May 5)
 Harris v Aaron c trial
 Hubbard v West c for trial

Latch v Latch (26) m d
 Pullin v Pullin c trial with
 wife
 Robinson v Phipps c trial
 Tolson v Sheard m d
 Attenborough v Shirlaw c
 trial
 Garth v Maitland sp c
 Sutton v Sutton c trial
 Tucker v Swinburne c trial
 Jones v Clifford c trial
 Hewland v Densham act trial
 Camps v Marshall f c
 Ellis-Nanney v Carnarvon-
 shire Slate Company (lim d)
 c trial with wife
 Bryant v Maisiey act trial
 (not before May 31)
 Lord Leigh v Street c trial
 Waterson v Heaven m judg-
 ment
 London, Chatham, and Dover
 Ry Co v Associatn of Land
 Financiers (limd) c trial
 Phillips v Wigan act trial
 Bibbens v Potter c trial
 Avery v Avery c trial
 Kingdon v Castleman c with
 wife
 Kimberley v Dick f c and 2
 sums to vary (transferred
 from M.B.)
 Hodgson v Coates c for trial
 Watkins v Stuart c for trial
 pro confesso
 Whitbread v Kingham a for
 trial (S.O.)
 Cobby v Cobby a for trial
 Conson v Sanderson c for trial
 In re Smith-Bridson v Smith
 m for judt
 Rowe v Grey a for trial
 Teape v Teape s c
 Pardoe v Griffiths m d
 The Newport Pagnel Ry Co,
 limd v The London &
 North-Western Ry Co a for
 trial (April 29)
 Gibbon v Watson c for trial
 Tanner v Sparks m d
 Richards v Jones f c
 Silber v Rylands & Co, limd
 m d (1874.—S.—No. 241)
 Silber v Rylands & Co, limd
 m d (1875.—S.—26)
 Griffiths v Pardo m d
 Padwick v Scott c trial
 Foster v Lumb c trial
 Johnson v Chatterton c trial
 In re Blades—Blades v Inman
 m judgt
 Medley v Hall f c
 Petherbridge v Michelmores c
 trial
 Brady v Parkinson f c
 Rowe v Lord Charles Ker
 f. c.
 Woodhouse v Woodhouse sp c
 Barnes v Barnes c trial

In re Frederick's Estate and
 Rossi v. Maund f c & summons
 Perkins v Perkins m d
 In re Adams's Estate and
 Adams v Adams f c and 2
 sums to vary
 Ridgway v Hilton House, &c.,
 Colliery Company limd. c
 trial
 James v Marsden act trial
 Bewley v Bewley f c
 Barker v Wood act trial
 Barge v Nicholls act trial
 from Stockton District Re-
 gistry
 Blackstock v Blackstock—
 Ashman v Blackstock f c
 Bailey v Walker c trial short
 Cave v Lander f c
 Smith v Hill act trial
 Montgomery v Stennett f c
 In re Badcock's Estate and
 Mussett v Bingle f c from
 chambers
 Cook v Cook c trial
 Hewitt v Hodges c trial
 Green v Carill act trial
 Wood v Calvert c trial
 Turner v Thomerson m
 judgt
 In re Eley and Malden v
 Soames act trial
 Poole v Poole f c.
 Wade v Burgess act trial
 Cust v Middleton f c
 Champney v Tigar f c
 Floyer v Storer f c
 Smith v Simpson act trial
 short
 Andrews v Mann f c
 Raphael v Spiers and Pond
 act trial
 Dent v Dent sp c
 Gregory v Dymoke f c (short)
 Adamson v Adamson motn
 judgt
 Matthews v Smith c trial
 Wane v Fitness c trial
 Vialls v Hall act trial
 Breton v Holloway f c
 Clapham v Thistleton f c
 Glascoe v Roworth c trial
 Fenwick v Goodchild c trial
 Macfarlane v Lister act trial
 Harris v Hoare c trial
 Norris v Fowler act trial
 Hardley v Owen act trial
 Kent v Scoles c trial (short)
 Wooler v Montague c trial
 Parker v Slade f c
 Hankey v Bridges f c
 Kitchin v Palmer c trial
 Fraser v Bothams c trial
 Addis v Addis f c
 Hankey v Gray f c
 Porter v Laddeley sp c
 Green v Oliver act trial (short)
 Barton v Drinkwater m judgt
 from Liverpool District
 Registry (short)

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS:

COOKSON—April 22, at 29, Rutland-gate, the wife of Montague Cookson, Q.C., of a son.

CUTBILL—April 21, at Lawrie House, Lewisham-hill, the wife of Alfred Cutbill, barrister-at-law, prematurely, of a son, stillborn.

MEDD—April 21, at 12, Harewood-square, N.W., the wife of Charles S. Medd, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

CLARK—ELLIS—April 20, at St. Peter's, Wickham-road, William John Hyne Clark, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, youngest son of Milbourne Clark, of Grove House, Dulwich-common, to Mary Graham, only daughter of the late Edward William Ellis, of Northfleet, Kent.

DERRY—POWELL—April 20, at Holy Trinity Church, Ventnor, Richard Courtenay Derry, of Ventnor and Sandown, solicitor, to Henrietta Mary Temple Grove (Detta), only daughter of the late James Powell, jun., solicitor, Chichester.

HEYWOOD—BELLHOUSE—April 22, at the church of St. John the Divine, Brooklands, by the Rev. H. Bethell Jones, M.A., Incumbent, George Washington Heywood, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, son of Alderman Heywood, Manchester, to Constance, daughter of Edward T. Bellhouse, of Sale Heys, Cheshire. No cards.

SMITH—BLOUET—April 19, at the parish church, Putney, Morton William Smith, of Eton Villa, Oxford-road, Putney, barrister-at-law, son of Frederick James Smith, barrister-at-law, Recorder of Margate, to Adrienne Ernestine Blanche Blouet, daughter of Mons. Charles Athenase Blouet, Paris.

DEATHS.

PRICE—April 17, suddenly, at his offices, 12, Serjeants'-inn, Fleet-street, James Price, solicitor, aged 51.

WORSLEY—April 20, at Heasle, East Yorks, suddenly, Reginald Worsley, solicitor, Marple, only son of the Rev. William Worsley, late Incumbent of Norbury, Cheshire, aged 34.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 21, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 12, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on April 28. Philbrick, Basinghall st, agent for Walker, Halifax, solicitor for the petitioner.

Civil, Military, Naval, and Clergy Supply Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 13, directed to be heard before the M.B. on April 29. Mason, Gresham st, solicitor for the petitioners.

Hawne Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 10, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, April 29. Lewty, Raymond building, Gray's inn, agent for Foster, Birmingham, solicitor for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, April 25, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Rangeworthy Coal and Iron Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on May 5. Janson and Co, Finsbury circus, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, April 25, 1876.

St David's Friendly Society, Ship and Pilot Inn, Newport, Monmouth. April 21

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 21, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Middleton, Francis George, and Samuel William Marriott, Tower st, Colonial Brokers. Pet April 19. Hazlitt. May 3 at 1
 Ward, Moses Mercer, Mark lane, Wine Merchant. Pet April 19. Brougham. May 3 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Bassell, John Francis, Blackpool Mills, Devon. Miller. Pet April 19. Edmonds. East Stonehouse, May 4 at 12
 Pridgen, Robert Thomas, Wencham, Norfolk, Farmer. Pet April 19. Partridge. King's Lynn, May 3 at 1
 Richards, Alfred, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet April 19. Falconer. Aberdare, May 2 at 11

TUESDAY, April 25, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Aschkinass, Wolf, Minories, Grocer. Pet April 24. Spring-Rice. May 9 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Binne, Thomas, Salford, Lancashire, Joiner. Pet April 21. Hulton. Salford, May 10 at 11
 Chaffer, Henry James, Thaxed, Essex, Fellmonger. Pet April 21. Gepp. Chelmsford, May 9 at 12
 Cook, James, Bishopstoke, Hants, Grocer. Pet April 19. Walker. Southampton, May 17 at 12

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate still remains at 2 per cent. The dealers have been principally occupied with the account, which shows a very heavy fall in most securities during the last fortnight. In the foreign market Spanish have declined to 14, in consequence of the unfavourable budget, which postpones any dividend until July, 1877. Turkish stocks are all lower, and Egyptian have been subject to the usual fluctuations, closing this week at rather lower prices than last account-day. The home railways all show a decline, the principal fall being in the Scotch lines, which have fallen 8 since last Friday. Midland and Great Eastern have also experienced a heavy fall. Consols have further improved to 95½ to 95½ for money and account.

Greenway, Thomas Frank, Birmingham, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet April 20. PARRY, Birmingham, May 8 at 2
Minks, Thomas, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Timber Dealer. Pet April 21.
Grimey, Ipswich, May 2 at 11

**Liquidation by Arrangement.
FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

TUESDAY, April 18, 1876.

Alvey, William, South Normanton, Derby, Blacksmith. May 5 at 12 at offices of Wilson, Alfreton
Beany, William, Sunderland, Durham, out of business. May 1 at 12 at offices of McKenna, Fawcett st, Sunderland
Beck, Edwin, Worcester, Baker. April 28 at 3 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, the Cross, Worcester
Blakeley, Benjamin, Earlsheaton, York, Worsted Spinner. May 9 at 3 at offices of Good, Dewsbury. Wilker
Bomford, Thomas, jun, Westmanote, Worcester, Farmer. April 28 at 3 at the White Horse Hotel, Congreve at, Birmingham. Edwards, Birmingham
Bradley, Charles, Salford, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. May 1 at 2 at offices of Dawson, Ridgefield, Manchester
Burrows, Amos, Boston, Lincoln, Fancy Dealer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Sneath, Sisey lane, Boston
Clemens, Samuel, Bury St Edmunds, Farmer. May 5 at 2.30 at offices of Partridge and Greene, Crown st, Bury St Edmunds
Corless, Thomas, Aston New town, nr Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. April 29 at 11 at offices of Ansell, Temple st, Birmingham
Cress, George Henry, Coombe Farm, Devon, Farmer. May 5 at 11.30 at the Queen's Hotel, Newton Abbot. Carter and Son, Torquay
Crone, James, Southwick, Durham, General Dealer. May 5 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
Davies, John Vaughton, Birmingham, Commercial Traveller. April 28 at 10.15 at offices of Jacques, Cherry at, Birmingham
Dixon, James William, West Lodge, Clapham common, Genl. May 8 at 3 at offices of Holmes, Clements lane, Lombard st
Eardley, William, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Butcher. April 27 at 11 at offices of Julian, Wedgwood chambers, Burslem
Feistead, George, Upper James st, Camden town, Greengrocer. April 16 at 2 at offices of Kennedy, Warwick court, Gray's inn
Fisher, John, Sheffield, Grocer. May 3 at 11 at offices of Webster, Hartshead, Sheffield
Gifford, Walter Edmund, Exmouth, Devon, Hotel Keeper. April 28 at 3 at offices of Fryer, Gandy st, Exeter
Goodwin, John, Devonport, Devon, Saddler. April 28 at 11 at offices of Curtis, St George's Hall, East Stonehouse
Hampson, James, Buxton, Gt. Britain, Commercial Traveller. April 29 at 11 at offices of Bush, St Nicholas buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Harper, Richard William, Barrowford, Lancashire, Overlooker. April 29 at 12 at offices of Hodgson, Cook lane, Keighley, York
Harris, James, Merthyr Tydyl, Weaver. April 28 at 11 at offices of Beedoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydyl
Harris, Thomas, New Swindon, Wills, Grocer. April 27 at 2 at offices of Burns, Wood st, Swindon
Harrison, Joseph, John Hutton Wilson, and Joseph Bennett, Idie, York, Engineers. May 3 at 10 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford
Henrie-Voyce, James, Sheffield, Perfumer. April 29 at 1 at offices of Fairburn, Bank st, Sheffield
Holden, Georgiana Eleanor, Brighton, Sussex, Boarding House Keeper. May 1 at 2 at offices of Braden and Gray, Midsal, Brighton
Jones, William, Middleborough, York, Hatter. April 25 at 10 at Abbott's Railway Hotel, York
Knowles, James, and George, Langley Bill, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Japanners. May 6 at 11 at offices of Underhill, Darlington st, Wolverhampton
Lang, George, Pendleton, Lancashire, Hardware Dealer. May 1 at 3 at offices of Dawson, Ridgefield, Manchester
Lloyd, George, Goodrich, Hereford, Butcher. May 3 at 12 at offices of Innell, High st, Ross. Williams, Ross
Lowe, William, High st, Camden town, Zinc Worker. April 25 at 12 at offices of Foster, Mercuulene
McIntyre, Donald, Penrance, Cornwall, Travelling Draper. April 29 at 3 at offices of Carlyon and Paull, Quay st, Truro
Melville, Alexander, Upper Park rd, Haverstock hill, Portrait Painter. May 3 at 3 at offices of Warrington, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
Miller, William, Southsea, Hants, Hardwareman. May 1 at 12 at 145, Chesapeake. King, Portsea
Minty, Theodore Hughes, Midsomer Norton, Somerset, Builder. April 29 at 3 at the Waldgrave Arms, Radstock. McCarthy, Frome
Mitchell, Henry Edward, Brighton, Sussex, Saw Manufacturer. May 2 at 3 at 145, Chesapeake. Brandreth and Gray, Brighton
Moffat, John, Sunderland, Durham, Carriage Proprietor. May 2 at 1 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
Morgan, William James, Friar st, Journalist. April 28 at 11 at offices of Crane, Palgrave place, Strand
Panter, Charles, Nutterton st, Caledonian rd, Cow Keeper. April 28 at 11 at offices of Drew, Fore st. Harrison, Goddard st
Parker, Elisabeth, John Parker, William Parker, and Daniel Parker, Elms, York, Brick Makers. May 5 at 11 at offices of Longbottom, Northgate chambers, Halifax
Payne, William Henry, Sunbury, Middlesex, Genl. April 28 at 3 at offices of Payne, Serjeants' Inn, Temple
Petherick, John, and Charles Frederick Petherick, Torrington, Devon, Plumbers. May 2 at 12 at offices of Thorne, Castle st, Barnstable
Poele, John Henry, Birmingham, Wire Manufacturer. May 3 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, New at, Birmingham. Griffin, Birmingham
Richards, William, Penzance, Cornwall, Carrier. May 1 at 11 at offices of Borsdale and Hilton, Clarence st, Penzance
Riley, John, Nottingham, Engineer. May 2 at 12 at offices of Brittle, St Peter's chambers, St Peter's gate, Nottingham
Robinson, James, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Currier. April 29 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Crews. Shires, Leicester
Ryder, George, Bournemouth, Hants, Tailor. April 26 at 2 at 2, Westover villa, Bournemouth. Aldridge and Sharp
Savage, William, West Malvern, Worcester, Boot Maker. April 26 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester

Sedgwick, Henry, Nottingham, Journeyman Brierykls. April 29 at 3 at the Prince of Wales Hotel, High at, Margate. Belk
Sharp, Mark, Boston, Leeds, Dryer. May 1 at 11 at offices of Middleton and Sons, Park row, Leeds
Slocumbe, George, Huntspill, Somerset, Corn Dealer. May 2 at 12 at offices of Smith, High at, Bridgewater
Stevens, William, Birmingham, Warehouseman. April 28 at 12 at the Union Hotel, Union st, Birmingham. Fallows, Birmingham
Stuart, John, Sheffeld, York, Grocer. May 3 at 11 at offices of Greaves and Allen, Old Haymarket, Sheffeld
Taylor, William, Radford, Nottingham, Wheelwright. April 28 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham
Thorpe, Edward, Hacknall Torkard, Nottingham, Blacksmith. April 28 at 3 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham
Tippett, John, Mawgan-in-Pyder, Cornwall, Farmer. April 28 at 12 at offices of Carlyon and Paull, Quay st, Truro
Tippett, John, jun, Mawgan-in-Pyder, Cornwall, Farmer. April 28 at 1 at offices of Carlyon and Paull, Quay st, Truro
Thompson, James, sen, and James Thompson, jun, Goswell rd, Clerkenwell, Frizette Manufacturers. May 3 at 2 at offices of Hales, Cliffords Inn, Fleet
Waring, Frances, Bradford, York, Furniture Broker. May 1 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrral st, Bradford
Warne, William Henry, and James Baker, Pittfield st, Hexton, Bedding Manufacturers. May 4 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham at. Wolferton, Ironmonger lane
Waterman, Elizabeth Ann Tregenna, East Stonehouse, Devon, Hotel Keeper. April 28 at 11 at offices of Rodda, Westwell st, Plymouth
West, John Black, Timberland Dale, Lincoln, Farmer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Benn, Church yard, Boston
White, Charles, Derby, Boot Manufacturer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Briggs, Amen alloy, Derby
White, Frederick Henry, Exeter, Clog Manufacturer. April 27 at 3 at offices of Daw, jun, City chambers, Gandy st, Exeter
Wills, John, Ford st, Buw, Shoe Manufacturer. April 25 at 3 at offices of Bath, King William st. Chipperfield, Trinity st, Southwark
Wilson, James, Earlsheaton, York, Blanket Manufacturer. May 2 at 11 at the Bull Hotel, Wakefield. Scholes and Son, Dewsbury
Wilson, Robert, Hereford, Veterinary Surgeon. April 29 at 3 at offices of Corner, High town, Hereford
Wood, Joseph, Leeds, no occupation. April 27 at 3 at offices of Turner, East parade, Leeds

FRIDAY, April 21, 1876.

Armitage, Louis Philip, King's cross, Coal Merchant. April 27 at 2 at offices of Chandler, Old Jewry
Bail, Spencer Alick, Congleton, Cheshire, Boot Maker. May 4 at 11 at offices of Cooper, West st, Congleton
Chapman, Mark, Newport, Monmouth, Plumber. May 8 at 10 at offices of Morgan, Dock st, Newport
Chappell, Henry, Kidwelly, Carmarthen, Innkeeper. May 5 at 10 at offices of Rees, Thomas st, Llanelly
Chesterfield, James, Hastings, Sussex, Cattle Food Manufacturer. May 5 at 12 at the Havelock Hotel, Hastings. Langham and Son, Hastings
Cook, James Herbert, Liverpool, Draper. May 8 at 3 at offices of Rogers, Lord st, Liverpool. Bacrell and Rowley, Liverpool
Cousins, Abraham, Great Tey, Essex, out of business. May 5 at 4 at offices of Jones, Town Hall chambers, Colchester
Cox, William, Birmingham, Shirt Manufacturer. April 28 at 11 at offices of Free, Temple row, Birmingham
Davies, Philip Lewis, Carmarthen, Tailor. May 4 at 10.30 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Bristol. Parry, Pembroke Dock
Edwards, John, Botesdale, Suffolk, Farmer. May 2 at 12 at the Bell Hotel, Ricklinghall Inferior. Gross
Evans, John, Nangetarthen, Carmarthen, Hotel Keeper. May 6 at 3 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen
Farrer, Henson, Bradford, York, Tailor. May 8 at 11 at offices of Gardiner, Bond st, Bradford
Gallagher, Michael, Willenhall, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. May 5 at 3 at offices of Dale, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
Godfrey, William, Teignmouth, Devon, Painter. May 5 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Pearson and Widdowson, Dawlish
Goldsmith, George Samuel, Westport, Suffolk, Beer Retailer. May 9 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Cross
Gould, Hugh John, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Contractor. May 5 at 10 at offices of Rees, Thomas st, Llanelly
Greville, Thomas Augustus Halpin, London Central Markets, Meat Salesman. May 5 at 2 at offices of Eagleton, Chancery lane
Hall, William, Hammersmith rd, Grocer. May 11 at 4 at offices of Wills and Waite, Carter lane, Doctors' commons
Hevson, John, Gorleston, Suffolk, Smack Owner. May 5 at 11 Cow, South Quay, Great Yarmouth
Howard, Ann, Canterbury, Grocer. May 5 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Minter, Folkestone
Jackson, William, Bowdley, Worcester, Plumber. May 10 at 3 at offices of Sanders, sen, and Burcher, Charch st, Kidderminster
Jewell, William Henry, Philpot lane, Fenchurch st, Wine Merchant. May 9 at 3 at offices of Brett and Co, Leadenhall st. Crook and Smith, Fenchurch st
Jones, Thomas Edward, Tredegar, Monmouth, Grocer. May 6 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Newport. Harris, Tredegar
Kenney, James Wigan, Lancashire, Labourer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Peace and Bell, Leader's buildings, King st, Wigan
Knights, Henry, Hales, Norfolk, Farmer. May 12 at 12 at Wiltshire, Half plain, Great Yarmouth
Lewis, Stephen, Begey, Narberth, Pembroke, Builder. May 6 at 11 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen
Littlehales, Charles, Combe Down, nr Bath, Somerset, Captain H.M.'s Army. May 1 at 12 at offices of Wilton, Westgate buildings, Bath
Lloyd, Napoleon Thomas, Birmingham, Commission Agent. May 5 at 11 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
Lowe, Eliab, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. April 26 at 10.15 at offices of Bell, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham
Mackay, Richard Cockrill, Bristol, Gold Leaf Printer. May 1 at 2 at offices of Sibly, Exchange west, Bristol
Maxted, Henry, Portsea, Hants, Hairdresser. May 5 at 4 at offices of Wainscot, Union st, Portsea. King, Portsea
McDonald, Randall, Liverpool, Hotel Keeper. May 9 at 2 at offices of Hughes, Lord st, Liverpool

Moore, Charles, Bristol mews, Amberley rd, Paddington, Cab Proprietor. May 9 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Smith and Co, Broad st, Chapsdale, Kent. May 17 at 1 at the Falstaff Hotel, Westgate without, Canterbury. Moss, Gracechurch st. Paine, Henry Berry, Broadway, Hammersmith, Hat Manufacturer. May 4 at 2 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate at within. Summershay, Gresham House. Ray, George, Sheffield, York, Butcher. May 4 at 12 at offices of Pattison, Queen st, Sheffield. Reader, John Thomas, Grove terrace, South Hackney, Fancy Stationer. May 1 at 1 at offices of Davis, Moorgate st. Rickatson, Hannah, Great Driffield, York, Confectioner. May 5 at 11 at offices of White, Exchange st, Great Driffield. Robinson, Robert, Salsbury, York, Innkeeper. May 5 at 11 at offices of Eastham, Church st, Clitheroe. Saxon, George Harry, Sutton, Surrey, Ship Broker. May 5 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Keighley and Co, Philpot lane. Sear, Thomas, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Beer Retailer. May 11 at 13 at offices of Fell, Aylesbury. Sheldrick, Aliott Thomas, Martin's lane, Cannon st, Coal Merchant. April 28 at 10 at offices of King, Martin's lane, Cannon st. Sherrin, Edward Barclay, Swansea, Glamorgan, Master Printer. April 29 at 11 at Worcester place, Swansea. Brown and Collins. Slater, John, Millom, Cumberland, Boot Maker. May 5 at 2 at offices of Sutler, Holborn hill, Millom. Thomas, David, Llanelli, Carmarthen, Cooper. May 4 at 11 at offices of Howell, Stepney st, Llanelli. Topham, Edward, Fulwood, nr Preston, Lancashire, Farmer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Thompson, Chapel st, Preston. Warren, James, Rupert st, Haymarket, Hotel Keeper. May 11 at 3 at offices of Digby, Lincoln's Inn fields. Weaver, Henry, Barton hill, St George, Gloucester, Beer Retailer. May 1 at 13 at offices of Essey, The Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Weil, Isidor, St George's place, Knightsbridge, Tobacconist. May 8 at 2 at 6, Frederick's place, Old Jewry. Maples and Co. Williams, Hugh, Llangoch, Holyhead, Anglesa, Draper. May 9 at 1 at the Ermine Hotel, Flooker's Brook, Chester. Jones, Menal Bridge. Winzar, John, Sturminster Newton, Dorset, Innkeeper. May 3 at 12 at the Crown Inn, Sturminster Newton. Atkinson. Wood, Richard, East Ardley, York, Farmer. May 8 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrril Bradford. Wright, William. May 2 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds.

A LUM BAY, FRESHWATER, ISLE OF WIGHT.
—THE ROYAL NEEDLES HOTEL is now open for the Season. S. W. R. to Lympington and Yarmouth. Pure air, delightful scenery, moderate charges. A well-appointed four-horse char-a-banc and a coach leave the Ventnor railway station for the Hotel every morning.—J. BRADLEY.

LAWYERS' LETTER BOXES.

"Exceedingly useful."—"Standard."
Invented and Manufactured by Henry Stone, Banbury.
Sold by all Stationers, but ask for STONE'S Patent Boxes.
Illustrated Catalogues post free.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.
—Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danes Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June 18, 1864, page 408.

The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.
CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits
Appeals
Parliamentary Minutes
Books
Pamphlets
Reports
Rules

Catalogues
Prospectuses
Magazines
Newspapers
Circulars
Posters
Handbills, &c., &c.

EDE AND SON.
ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,
To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench
Corporation of London, &c.
SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.
BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.
CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY ROBES &c
ESTABLISHED 1689.
94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S
LIST OF ESTATES AND HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 30, Chapsdale, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

HERTFORDSHIRE.

The Whitehall Estate, at Bennington, midway between Hertford, Welwyn, and Stevenage, comprising a capital moderate-sized Country House, standing on a hill, commanding an extensive view over an undulating and picturesque country, bounded in the distance by the high lands near Much Hadham and Albury; the fine old church at Little Munden being a conspicuous object in the foreground. It has nine bed-rooms and two dressing-rooms, drawing-room 21ft. by 17ft. 6in., dining-room about 27ft. by 17ft., morning-room, library, and offices; first-class stabling for three or four horses, coach-house, cottages, barn, farmery, and premises; lawns, ornamental grounds, kitchen-gardens, park lands, with plantations, and a very picturesque wood, in all 37a. 0r. 25p. With possession.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER
are instructed by H. Finch, Esq., the Proprietor, who has occupied the property some years and has lately removed to London, to SELL the before-mentioned, at the MART, on TUESDAY, MAY 16, at TWO.

Particulars and plans of
Messrs. BUDD & SON, Solicitors, 33, Bedford-row;
and of the Auctioneers, 50, Chapsdale.

TO BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS, AND OTHERS.

Valuable chambers in New-square, Lincoln's-Inn, and Policies of Assurance.

TO be SOLD by TENDER.—The Vendor's interest in a double set of chambers on the first floor of No. 11, New-square, Lincoln's-Inn, containing Seven Rooms with appurtenances.

These Chambers are held by the Vendor under the Honourable Society of Lincoln's-Inn, subject to payment of a yearly rent-charge of £1 for dues for two lives, the first now running in the life of the Vendor, and the second the life of any person in succession of any age to be nominated by the owner for the time being on the falling in of the first life.

The present value is £450 a year.

Possession if desired at Midsummer next.

Also three Policies of Insurance on the first life for £5,000 and upwards, including bonus additions, subject to payment of £145 0s. 4d. of annual premiums.

Particulars and conditions of sale may be obtained at the office of Mr. ROBERT SKEET, Solicitor, No. 7, South-square, Gray's-Inn. Sealed Tenders for the said chambers, and Policies, together or separately, to be addressed under cover to Mr. Skeet.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London. E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-Inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS,

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 20s.

DRAFT PAPER, 5s. 6d., 6s. 6d., 7s. 6d., and 8s. 6d. per ream.
BRIEF PAPER, 15s. 6d., 17s. 6d., and 23s. 6d. per ream.
FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s. 6d., 14s. 6d., and 18s. 6d. per ream.
CREAM-LAID NOTE, 3s., 4s., and 5s. per ream.
LARGE CREAM-LAID NOTE, 4s. 6d., 6s. 6d., and 8s. per ream.
BLUE NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per ream.
ENVELOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per 1000.
THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, extra secure, 5s. 6d. per 1000.
FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s. 9d. per 100.
PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM VOVE CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s. 6d. per ream. This incomparable Paper has raised up a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM-VOVE CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

INDENTURE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s. 3d. each, 30s. 6oz., 135s. per roll.

SECOND OR FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 115s. 9d. roll.

RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

Ledgers, Day Books, Cash Books, Letter or Minute Book
An immense stock in various bindings.

3.
ing
and
mth.
I.C.
cor-
and

d,
ry
an
ba
at
as
7
7,
b,
e,
as

R
cc-
as
at

n.
11,
r-
ty
for
hs
mi

p-
of

er

ice
no
ted
E-
AL
n-

st-

s,

er
at
&
mi

a

fr
at
th
A
S
R
co
a
ju
w
tr
in
co
C
h
ju
th
th
th
no
by
ha
on